

CLASS 6

Donald F. Bigelow.
Thomas D. Davis.
Samuel S. Dickson.
Harold D. Finley.
Walter A. Foote.
Bernard Gotlieb.

William J. Grace.
Stanley Hawks.
Stewart E. McMillin.
Walter T. Prendergast.
Gaston Smith.
Gilbert R. Wilson.

CLASS 7

Maurice W. Altaffer.
Paul Bowerman.
Paul H. Foster.
Bernard F. Hale.
John F. Huddleston.
Carl D. Meinhardt.

Harvey Lee Milbourne.
Hugh S. Miller.
Julian L. Pinkerton.
Leland L. Smith.
Edward B. Thomas.
Mason Turner.

CLASS 8

Knox Alexander.
Vinton Chapin.
Prescott Childs.
Lewis Clark.
William M. Gwynn.

George F. Kennan.
Gordon P. Merriam.
Samuel Reber, jr.
Joseph C. Satterthwaite.
S. Walter Washington.

PATENT OFFICE

Frank Petrus Edinburg to be examiner in chief.
Fred Merriam Hopkins to be Assistant Commissioner of Pat-
ents.

Paul Preston Pierce to be examiner in chief.
Elonzo Tell Morgan to be examiner in chief.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

Jeannette A. Hyde, district No. 32, Honolulu, Hawaii.
Robert B. Morris, district No. 22, Galveston, Tex.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Knox McEwen, Rockford.
Leonard F. Underwood, Shawmut.

ARKANSAS

Nannie L. Connevey, Bauxite.

ARIZONA

Ezbon E. Cooper, Chandler.

CONNECTICUT

Francis W. Chaffee, jr., Eagleville.
Edward F. Schmidt, Westbrook.

GEORGIA

Edwin R. Orr, Dublin.

INDIANA

Ella S. Shesler, Burnettsville.
Rexford F. Hinkle, Hymers.
Lee Roy Calaway, La Fontaine.
Hugh A. Fenters, Macy.
Earl R. Shinn, Mentone.

IOWA

Homer G. Games, Calamus.
Raymond W. Ellis, Norwalk.
William W. Sturdivant, Wesley.

KANSAS

Walter Holman, Sharon.

MAINE

Henry W. Bowen, Chebeague Island.
Lillian L. Guptill, Newcastle.
George O. Carr, Norridgewock.
Carroll H. Clark, Ogunquit.
Alfonzo F. Flint, West Buxton.

MASSACHUSETTS

Harold E. Cairns, Bernardston.
Albert W. Haley, Rowley.
Frances C. Hill, Templeton.

MICHIGAN

Milo E. Blanchard, Hersey.
Eugene E. Hubbard, Hudsonville.
Minnie E. Allen, Leslie.
Otto L. Wickersham, Onaway.
John W. Barton, Otsego.

MISSOURI

Arthur Rice, Alton.
Ferd D. Lahmeyer, Bland.
Charles B. Genz, Louisiana.
George W. Davies, Osceola.
W. Arthur Smith, Purdin.
Philip G. Wild, Spickard.

NEBRASKA

Herbert M. Hanson, Clay Center.
Andrew E. Stanley, Loomis.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Harriet A. Reynolds, Kingston.

NEW YORK

Albert C. Stanton, Atlanta.
Harry L. Carhart, Coeymans.
DeWitt C. Talmage, East Hampton.
Clarence F. Dilcher, Elba.
John A. Rapelye, Flushing.
Clarence M. Herrington, Johnsonville.
Emma P. Taylor, Mexico.
William V. Horne, Mohegan Lake.
LeRoy Powell, Mount Vernon.
Dana J. Duggan, Niagara University.
Henry C. Windeknecht, Rensselaer.

NORTH DAKOTA

Ole T. Nelson, Stanley.

OHIO

Bolivar C. Reber, Loveland.
Solomon J. Goldsmith, Painesville.

OKLAHOMA

William C. Yates, Comanche.
Ben F. Ridge, Duncan.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Paul F. W. Waller, Myers.

TENNESSEE

John B. Elliott, Athens.
John S. Wisecarver, Mohawk.

TEXAS

Ferman Wardell, Avery.
Annie B. Causey, Doucette.
William W. Sloan, Falfurrias.
Thomas L. Byran, Matador.
Walter E. Shannon, North Zulch.
John W. Waide, Paint Rock.
Mamie Milan, Prairie View.
Billie W. Sorey, Refugio.
Claud C. Morris, Rosebud.
Lee W. Harris, Seymour.
Ada A. Ladner, Yorktown.

VIRGINIA

Roland L. Somers, Bloxom.
Silverius C. Hall, Hallwood.
William P. Nye, jr., Radford.
George N. Kirk, St. Charles.
Herbert T. Thomas, Williamsburg.

WASHINGTON

Sylvester G. Buell, Arlington.

WEST VIRGINIA

Shirley H. Mitchell, Elizabeth.
Charles J. Parsons, Sabraton.
Archie J. Frazier, Triadelphia.

WYOMING

Ralph R. Long, Gillette.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, May 9, 1930

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, Thou hast dealt gently with us. With grateful affection may we walk with Thee to-day. As we have experienced the common bounty of Thy providence, may we acknowledge Thee as our sovereign Lord. Grant that we may have a more perfect sense of being Thy children; may we love Thee because Thou didst first love us. It was first Thy outreaching arms that kept us at Thy feet. Do Thou remember all parts of our land. Abide with our President, our Speaker, and all Members and officers of this House. O may our laws be just and their execution impartial. As with Thee there is no night, let the darkness of this world seem to Thy children as the shadow of Thy wings. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Crockett, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

- H. R. 645. An act for the relief of Lyman Van Winkle;
 H. R. 1794. An act to authorize the payment of an indemnity to the owners of the British steamship *Kyleakin* for damages sustained as a result of a collision between that vessel and the U. S. S. *William O'Brien*;
 H. R. 1954. An act for the relief of A. O. Gibbens;
 H. R. 2902. An act to authorize the sale of the Government property acquired for a post-office site in Binghamton, N. Y.;
 H. R. 3246. An act to authorize the sale of the Government property acquired for a post-office site in Akron, Ohio;
 H. R. 3717. An act to add certain lands to the Fremont National Forest in the State of Oregon;
 H. R. 7069. An act for the relief of the heirs of Viktor Pettersson;
 H. R. 7832. An act to reorganize the administration of Federal prisons; to authorize the Attorney General to contract for the care of United States prisoners; to establish Federal jails, and for other purposes;
 H. R. 8578. An act to sell the present post-office site and building at Dover, Del.;
 H. R. 8918. An act authorizing conveyance to the city of Trenton, N. J., of title to a portion of the site of the present Federal building in that city;
 H. R. 9324. An act to dedicate for street purposes a portion of the old post-office site at Wichita, Kans.;
 H. R. 9325. An act to authorize the United States Veterans' Bureau to pave the road running north and south immediately east of and adjacent to Hospital No. 90, at Muskogee, Okla., and to authorize the use of \$4,950 of funds appropriated for hospital purposes, and for other purposes;
 H. R. 9407. An act to amend the act of Congress approved May 29, 1928, authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to accept title to certain real estate, subject to a reservation of mineral rights in favor of the Blackfeet Tribe of Indians;
 H. R. 9437. An act to authorize a necessary increase in the White House police force;
 H. R. 9758. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to close certain portions of streets and alleys for public-school purposes; and
 H. R. 9845. An act to authorize the transfer of Government-owned land at Dodge City, Kans., for public-building purposes.
- The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:
- H. R. 1234. An act to authorize the Postmaster General to impose demurrage charges on undelivered collect-on-delivery parcels;
 H. R. 7405. An act to provide for a 5-year construction and maintenance program for the United States Bureau of Fisheries;
 H. R. 7412. An act to provide for the diversification of employment of Federal prisoners, for their training and schooling in trades and occupations, and for other purposes;
 H. R. 7955. An act making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for other purposes;
 H. R. 8296. An act to amend the act of May 25, 1926, entitled "An act to adjust water-right charges, to grant certain other relief on the Federal irrigation projects, and for other purposes";
 H. R. 9895. An act to establish the Carlsbad Caverns National Park in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes;
 H. R. 11588. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war; and
 H. J. Res. 270. Joint resolution authorizing an appropriation to defray the expenses of the participation of the Government in the Sixth Pan American Child Congress, to be held at Lima, Peru, July, 1930.
- The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:
- S. 317. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant certain oil and gas prospecting permits and leases;
 S. 319. An act granting an increase of pension to Irene Rucker Sheridan;
 S. 497. An act to provide for the erection and operation of public bathhouses at Hot Springs, N. Mex.;
 S. 543. An act to increase the pay of mail carriers in the village delivery service;

- S. 557. An act to authorize the disposition of certain public lands in the State of Nevada;
 S. 612. An act for the relief of Charles Parshall, Fort Peck Indian allottee, of the Fort Peck Reservation, Mont.;
 S. 1183. An act to authorize the conveyance of certain land in the Hot Springs National Park, Ark., to the F. F. Connelly Paving Co.;
 S. 1299. An act for the relief of C. M. Williamson, C. E. Liljenquist, Lottie Redman, and H. N. Smith;
 S. 1533. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to extend the time for payment of charges due on Indian irrigation projects, and for other purposes;
 S. 2524. An act for the relief of J. A. Lemire;
 S. 3088. An act for the relief of R. B. Miller;
 S. 3171. An act for the relief of Edward C. Compton;
 S. 3178. An act to authorize the collection of additional postage on insufficiently or improperly addressed mail to which directory service is accorded;
 S. 3258. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes;
 S. 3386. An act giving the consent and approval of Congress to the Rio Grande compact signed at Santa Fe, N. Mex., on February 12, 1929;
 S. 3599. An act to provide for the classification of extraordinary expenditures contributing to the deficiency of postal revenues;
 S. 3646. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary Willoughby Osterhaus;
 S. 3970. An act authorizing the Smithsonian Institution to extend the Natural History Building and authorizing an appropriation therefor, and for other purposes;
 S. 4119. An act to extend the provisions of section 2455 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (U. S. C., title 43, sec. 1171), as amended, to coal lands in Alabama;
 S. 4169. An act to add certain lands to the Zion National Park in the State of Utah, and for other purposes;
 S. 4170. An act to provide for the addition of certain lands to the Bryce Canyon National Park, Utah, and for other purposes;
 S. 4196. An act to authorize the construction, maintenance, and operation of a bridge across the St. Francis River in Craighead County, Ark.;
 S. 4211. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the elimination of the Michigan Avenue grade crossing in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1927;
 S. 4221. An act for the disposal of combustible refuse from places outside of the city of Washington;
 S. 4222. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to sell by private or public sale a tract of land acquired for public purposes, and for other purposes;
 S. 4223. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the elimination of grade crossings of steam railroads in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1927;
 S. 4224. An act to provide for the operation and maintenance of bathing pools under the jurisdiction of the Director of Public Buildings and Parks of the National Capital;
 S. 4226. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to sell at public or private sale certain real property owned by the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and
 S. 4243. An act to provide for the closing of certain streets and alleys in the Reno section of the District of Columbia.
- The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the amendment of the Senate No. 98 to the bill (H. R. 6564) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for other purposes."
- The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4138) entitled "An act to amend the act of March 2, 1929, entitled 'An act to enable the mothers and widows of the deceased soldiers, sailors, and marines of the American forces now interred in the cemeteries of Europe to make a pilgrimage to these cemeteries.'"
- The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 549) entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes."

HIGH-SCHOOL BUILDING AT BROWNING, MONT.

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 4098) to provide funds for cooperation with the school board at Browning, Mont., in the extension of the high-school building to be available to Indian children of the Blackfeet Indian Reservation.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that this is a Senate bill, a similar House bill being on the calendar.

Mr. LEAVITT. Yes; an identical House bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$40,000 for the purpose of cooperating with the public-school board of district No. 9, town of Browning and county of Glacier, Mont., for the extension and betterment of a public high-school building at Browning, Mont.: *Provided*, That the expenditure of any money so appropriated shall be subject to the express condition that the school maintained by the said school district in the said building shall be available to all Indian children of the Blackfeet Indian Reservation, Mont., on the same terms, except as to payment of tuition, as other children of said school district: *Provided further*, That such expenditures shall be subject to such further conditions as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARNER. Reserving the right to object, as I understand this is a Senate bill, a similar House bill being on the calendar?

Mr. LEAVITT. An identical House bill is on the calendar.

Mr. GARNER. What is the emergency?

Mr. LEAVITT. It is an emergency in view of the fact that it is necessary to pass the bill in order to get the appropriation in the deficiency bill, so that the building can be constructed this summer.

Mr. GARNER. What is the obligation on the part of the Government to participate in this?

Mr. LEAVITT. Because more than half of the pupils are Indian children.

Mr. GARNER. Does this come out of the Indian fund?

Mr. LEAVITT. No; out of the Treasury.

Mr. GARNER. What is the obligation on the part of the Government to take care of these children?

Mr. LEAVITT. The original school building was constructed in the same way, by cooperation between the Government and the school district.

Mr. GARNER. What committee reported the bill?

Mr. LEAVITT. The Indian Committee.

Mr. GARNER. Was it a unanimous report?

Mr. LEAVITT. Yes.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider by Mr. LEAVITT was laid on the table.

THE CARLSBAD CAVERNS NATIONAL PARK

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the bill (H. R. 9895) to establish the Carlsbad Caverns National Park in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes, from the Speaker's table, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the bill and the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill and the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 19, after "Interior," insert "to include any or all of the following-described lands, to wit: Sections 1, 12, and 13, township 24 south, range 22 east; sections 1 to 18, inclusive, 20 to 28, inclusive, and 33 to 36, inclusive, township 24 south, range 23 east; the entire township 24 south, range 24 east; sections 6, 7, 18, and 19, and 27 to 34, inclusive, township 24 south, range 25 east; sections 24, 25, 35, and 36, township 25 south, range 22 east; the entire township 25 south, range 23 east; north half of township 25 south, range 24 east; sections 5, 6, 7, 8, 17, and 18, township 25 south, range 25 east; sections 1, 2, 11, 12, 13, and 14, and 19 to 36, inclusive, township 26 south, range 22 east; west half of township and sections 22 to 26, inclusive, township 26 south, range 23 east; all with respect to the New Mexico principal meridian."

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Speaker, let me say that I have conferred with Judge EVANS, the ranking minority member of the committee, and the Senate amendment is agreeable to him.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Reserving the right to object, does the Senate amendment broaden the provisions of the bill as it passed the House?

Mr. COLTON. No; the amendment specifies the boundaries of the land which may be taken in. It does not broaden the bill at all.

Mr. SABATH. Reserving the right to object, how much land does this include, and is it now owned by the Government?

Mr. COLTON. It is owned by the Government and is now a national monument. This simply changes the status and makes it a national park.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

PENSIONS

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 12205) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and so forth, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, and ask unanimous consent also that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill H. R. 12205, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota further asks unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill.

The bill is a substitute for the following House bills referred to said committee:

| | |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| H. R. 430. Charles H. Anderson. | H. R. 5472. Glenn Lynch. |
| H. R. 517. Joseph C. Neihemer. | H. R. 5553. Dorcas L. Jenkins. |
| H. R. 611. Margaret Dolson. | H. R. 5587. Sarah Ann Combs. |
| H. R. 637. Walker Cooper. | H. R. 5595. Dennis W. Marshall. |
| H. R. 677. George W. Vineyard. | H. R. 5604. Theodore R. Beard. |
| H. R. 765. Gertrude Delaney. | H. R. 5766. Anita White. |
| H. R. 813. Dora Probst. | H. R. 5783. James J. O'Hearn. |
| H. R. 850. Marie Piatt Wilson. | H. R. 5784. Frances S. Everhart. |
| H. R. 943. James P. Roche. | H. R. 5786. John W. Witherow. |
| H. R. 1095. William E. Emerson. | H. R. 5812. Rose Edwards. |
| H. R. 1128. George Gambill. | H. R. 5816. Conrad E. Nelson. |
| H. R. 1342. Samuel L. Gibson. | H. R. 5846. Marian L. Navarre. |
| H. R. 1344. Chalmer Rayburn Hiatt. | H. R. 5841. Bridget Mary King. |
| H. R. 1351. Asa S. Abbott. | H. R. 5858. Allison D. McKinney. |
| H. R. 1436. Lillian Mae Yurasko. | H. R. 5866. Sarah Seiber. |
| H. R. 1437. John W. H. Deal. | H. R. 5929. R. G. Kimbell. |
| H. R. 1505. Luella H. Schreiner. | H. R. 5930. Mary C. Chapman. |
| H. R. 1535. Otho W. Thomas. | H. R. 5940. Anna Finneran. |
| H. R. 1545. Mary E. Schmidt. | H. R. 5942. Emma N. Mittendorf. |
| H. R. 1630. Red Owl. | H. R. 5977. Mary A. Blood. |
| H. R. 1857. Lester G. Cross. | H. R. 5986. Roy Elrod. |
| H. R. 1896. Benjamin F. Kabosky. | H. R. 6000. William Valentine. |
| H. R. 1982. Jesse A. Sparks. | H. R. 6158. Agnes Kimball. |
| H. R. 1989. Robert C. Brown. | H. R. 6202. James O'Neil. |
| H. R. 2044. Belle Brown. | H. R. 6250. Jesse P. Murphy. |
| H. R. 2132. Oscar Fields. | H. R. 6467. William M. Davis. |
| H. R. 2415. Louis Klein. | H. R. 6552. Blanche E. L. Niles. |
| H. R. 2488. Benjamin B. Redman. | H. R. 6629. Ettie Allen. |
| H. R. 2862. Frank Bryan. | H. R. 6682. James Carr. |
| H. R. 2864. Mabel Iller. | H. R. 6690. John M. Stephens. |
| H. R. 2924. Claudia V. Hester. | H. R. 6764. Ezilda Von Buelow. |
| H. R. 2947. Lottie Tavender. | H. R. 6766. Rosa Jordan. |
| H. R. 2960. Charlie Theodore McGraw. | H. R. 6816. Jesse W. Glass. |
| H. R. 3077. George W. Bowman. | H. R. 6820. Charles Jackson. |
| H. R. 3303. Michael Sheridan. | H. R. 6834. Dewey G. Saylor. |
| H. R. 3323. Kathrine Harris. | H. R. 6905. George M. Purdy. |
| H. R. 3457. Marie Thorson. | H. R. 6924. William Sully. |
| H. R. 3501. John H. Milby. | H. R. 6937. Constant W. Merrick. |
| H. R. 3524. Martha Crunsach. | H. R. 6971. Monroe C. Burdshaw. |
| H. R. 3613. Cecelia Roland. | H. R. 7009. Nicholas P. Broadway. |
| H. R. 3795. William J. Trevesick. | H. R. 7036. Ella Holt. |
| H. R. 3957. Abbie A. Oxley. | H. R. 7061. Lillas Cox. |
| H. R. 3976. Charles H. Rice. | H. R. 7073. Gertrude M. Kahler. |
| H. R. 3990. Joseph H. Carson. | H. R. 7077. Frank E. Abernathy. |
| H. R. 4087. Charles Brussow. | H. R. 7098. Sallie J. Dupree. |
| H. R. 4097. Frank E. Trimyer. | H. R. 7104. David Simmons. |
| H. R. 4098. Joseph B. Nee. | H. R. 7113. Eda Blankart Funston. |
| H. R. 4172. Albert Allen. | H. R. 7162. Colonel L. Lankford. |
| H. R. 4183. Lula R. Prince. | H. R. 7197. James G. Whalin. |
| H. R. 4241. Ann Walters. | H. R. 7218. Michael D. Papero. |
| H. R. 4261. Samuel M. Billingsley. | H. R. 7221. Mae R. Braman. |
| H. R. 4323. Rilla Long. | H. R. 7301. Sallie Matthews. |
| H. R. 4423. Charles M. Slever, jr. | H. R. 7306. Mattie Wade. |
| H. R. 4482. Ernest Killian. | H. R. 7310. Mrs. Frederick J. Oppermann. |
| H. R. 4539. Laura B. Lindsey. | H. R. 7320. Dewitt C. Hackley. |
| H. R. 4569. Roland Robertson. | H. R. 7343. Decatur D. Kinser. |
| H. R. 4722. Nathaniel S. Conrad. | H. R. 7351. Susan Hogan Duncan. |
| H. R. 4797. George Fleischbauer. | H. R. 7366. George E. Bayliss. |
| H. R. 4809. Hugo Frie. | H. R. 7424. Edward Eason. |
| H. R. 4928. Alice E. Holliday. | H. R. 7428. George A. Wilcox. |
| H. R. 5070. Elizabeth Oatman. | H. R. 7442. David T. Kirby. |
| H. R. 5119. August Richards. | H. R. 7444. Ava G. Baughman. |
| H. R. 5140. Mattie E. Dockery. | H. R. 7453. Eva Fleming. |
| H. R. 5153. William E. Monroe. | H. R. 7466. James W. Headly. |
| H. R. 5157. Isaac T. Osler. | H. R. 7485. Adelbert Carpenter. |
| H. R. 5162. Mary C. Benthin. | H. R. 7490. Dallas F. Jarvis. |
| H. R. 5239. Arizona Flener. | H. R. 7522. Mary D. Love. |
| H. R. 5244. Elden Cooper. | H. R. 7542. Mary L. Sumney. |
| H. R. 5379. Thomas F. Coyne. | H. R. 7561. Isaac C. Livingston. |
| H. R. 5454. Charlotte M. Kelly. | H. R. 7646. Owidier Ipock. |
| H. R. 5461. Anna Dix. | |

H. R. 7690. RAYON Cawood.
H. R. 7723. Robert Goodman.
H. R. 7746. William C. Rives.
H. R. 7779. John A. Kelley.
H. R. 7791. Swift Cary.
H. R. 7818. William C. Hopkins.
H. R. 7898. William A. Keating.
H. R. 8048. William Rivers Patter-
son.

H. R. 8082. Helen K. Whelan.
H. R. 8085. Rheed Flener.
H. R. 8106. Katherine T. Fink.
H. R. 8109. William C. Andrews.
H. R. 8179. Martin J. Kaplan.
H. R. 8208. George S. Thompson.
H. R. 8231. Joel Buell Shomaker.
H. R. 8270. Abram J. Coalson.
H. R. 8280. Catherine I. Goughan.
H. R. 8312. Marshall E. Hord.
H. R. 8355. Georgina Leitch.
H. R. 8357. Henrik J. Rasmussen.
H. R. 8383. James A. McCracken.
H. R. 8412. Margurite Isabelle Nunn.
H. R. 8505. Genevive M. Blazer.
H. R. 8509. George M. Hart.
H. R. 8542. Henry Y. Blackwell.
H. R. 8551. Elizabeth Hahn.
H. R. 8552. Mary Kiger.
H. R. 8599. Curtis A. Peterson.
H. R. 8725. John Anderson.
H. R. 8735. Lavina Laughlin.
H. R. 8752. Mary J. Thompson.
H. R. 8797. Maude McManus.
H. R. 8801. Teresa D. McClintic.
H. R. 8824. Nathaniel Elliott.
H. R. 8865. Peyton Paramore.
H. R. 9008. Talton Combs.
H. R. 9029. Charles Rapier.
H. R. 9120. Saddle S. Jordan.
H. R. 9172. Clara L. Hunt.
H. R. 9222. Jane Harmony.
H. R. 9249. John Albert Fritz.
H. R. 9258. Thomas Keenan.
H. R. 9284. Fannie S. Skinner.
H. R. 9311. Oscar T. Ginn.
H. R. 9388. M. F. Jamar.
H. R. 9417. William S. Evans.
H. R. 9419. Minerva Carrico.

H. R. 9429. Joseph M. Yadon.
H. R. 9530. Nellie A. Haack.
H. R. 9533. Fred K. Johnson.
H. R. 9543. Mary L. Beery.
H. R. 9545. Joseph H. Kellerman.
H. R. 9566. John T. Cooper.
H. R. 9570. John W. Zibble.
H. R. 9657. Julia A. Ray.
H. R. 9683. Perry M. Martin.
H. R. 9710. Harry Ray Bennett.
H. R. 9879. Annie Burkard.
H. R. 9968. Owen Williams.
H. R. 9977. John R. Ferrell.
H. R. 10012. Rachel Stoser.
H. R. 10016. William A. Shirey.
H. R. 10063. Anna T. MacLay.
H. R. 10186. Robert L. Boyd.
H. R. 10240. Ellen J. Lewis.
H. R. 10261. Josephine O'Bryan.
H. R. 10286. Eugene Gray.
H. R. 10299. Otto A. Granholm.
H. R. 10315. Charles Chesnut.
H. R. 10363. Vivian L. Saunders.
H. R. 10388. Horace E. Hobbs.
H. R. 10435. Walter W. McGowen.
H. R. 10438. John E. Quinn.
H. R. 10439. Carl L. Quinn.
H. R. 10446. Lula Smith.
H. R. 10448. Mrs. John Hindemeier.
H. R. 10487. Thomas Henry Shanley.
H. R. 10604. Willie Herschel Meek.
H. R. 10686. Margaret O'Brien.
H. R. 10696. Eliza Carr.
H. R. 10711. George Earle Barr.
H. R. 10799. Mary L. Leverton.
H. R. 10837. William Marks.
H. R. 10874. Frank J. Long.
H. R. 10892. George Kohler.
H. R. 10922. Ralph Smith.
H. R. 11035. Mary Heckle.
H. R. 11126. Matthew J. McKelvey.
H. R. 11221. Waldo E. Stucker.
H. R. 11377. Harlen P. Shrader.
H. R. 11424. Thomas A. Ellis.
H. R. 11657. Annie J. Heller.
H. R. 11842. Lammie Clement.

during the past few years, that it is confidently expected that several hundred thousands of visitors will come to the caverns in 1930.

Mr. Speaker, the Denver Post in its issue of the 6th of March, 1930, had the following to say about the Carlsbad Caverns National Park:

This marvelous scenic attraction, this superb bit of nature, is the eighth wonder of the world. It is the greatest, most startling, and most beautiful natural cave upon this planet. It is located in our neighboring State of New Mexico. It belongs to our Rocky Mountain region, and we all in this region have a right to be proud of it and take an interest in it.

Realizing the tremendous beauty of our newest national park, I had the honor within the past few weeks to extend an invitation on behalf of the people of New Mexico to the President of the United States to visit the Carlsbad Caverns National Park on his forthcoming western trip. The Governor of New Mexico, both our Senators, and the civic organizations of many communities in our State have joined in urging the President to accept our invitation.

The Director of the National Park Service, in making comment on the creation of the new park, said—

That for spacious chambers, for variety and beauty of multitudinous natural decorations, and for general scenic quality it is the king of its kind.

Mr. Speaker, time is for mortals but not for the processes of nature. Doubtless through millions of years the infinite, patient, and powerful action of nature through erosion by subterranean waters has been used to produce this present sublime group of caverns. For the speaker it is a pleasant, happy thought to think that he has been able to be the humble instrument for the creation of the Carlsbad Caverns National Park, which is now established to perpetually furnish interest to the scientist and tourist alike.

EMBARGO ON SILVER IMPORTATIONS

Mr. ARENTZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENTZ. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, the other day we disposed of the so-called silver tariff items in the tariff bill placing a tariff of 30 cents an ounce on silver. The House refused to accept this schedule. I think something should be done to help the silver-mining situation in America, and I hope this can be brought about by a bill which I placed in the basket this morning, which places an embargo upon importations of silver into the United States. Those in the New England States who voted against the tariff on silver can very easily agree to the proposition which I have presented to them to-day. We can use our own silver of which we produce a surplus. By flooding this country with foreign silver it logically follows that the price of domestic silver will be depressed. We wish to further prevent this.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENTZ. I want to proceed with the reading of the bill.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Why not include coal from Russia?

Mr. ARENTZ. The House can include whatever it wants to include. I am trying to place an embargo on silver. I am in favor of excluding both coal and other raw material replacing American goods, thus replacing American workmen. The bill I introduced reads as follows:

TO PLACE AN EMBARGO ON SILVER

That from and after the passage of this act silver from any foreign country shall not be entitled to entry at any of the ports of the United States, and the importation thereof into the United States is hereby prohibited: *Provided, however,* That silver-bearing ores, mattes, base bullion silver dross, reclaimed silver, scrap silver, and all alloys or combinations of silver imported into the United States for the purpose of processing, refining, or minting for export to a foreign country and not for use, sale, or disposition within the United States or any of its possessions, may be imported for such purpose upon the execution of a bond given in double the amount of the estimated value upon such silver contents so imported, conditioned that such silver contents will not be used, sold, or otherwise disposed of in the United States.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and empowered, and it shall be his duty, to make the necessary orders and regulations to carry this law into effect or to suspend the same as herein provided and to send copies thereof to the proper officers in the United States and to such officers and agents in foreign countries as he shall judge necessary.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

THE CARLSBAD CAVERNS NATIONAL PARK

Mr. SIMMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD upon the subject of the Carlsbad Caverns National Parks bill, just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMMS. Mr. Speaker, the Simms bill (H. R. 9895) to establish the Carlsbad Caverns National Park in the southeastern part of New Mexico after passing the House of Representatives was referred to the Senate Committee on Public Lands and Surveys. There Senator CUTTING, of New Mexico, rendered valuable aid toward the passage of the bill by having inserted a necessary amendment limiting the amount of land authorized to be acquired, in the discretion of the Department of the Interior, to be added to the limits of the park whenever necessary. The bill came back to the House, the amendment was accepted, the bill was finally passed, went to the White House, was signed by President Hoover, and is now the law of the land. I requested the President to give me the pen with which the bill was signed, and I had much pleasure in sending it to the chamber of commerce at Carlsbad, to be kept as a souvenir of the occasion.

Mr. Speaker, the State of New Mexico and all its people are greatly indebted to the Congress of the United States for putting its hall mark of approval on this park which preserves for the American people one of the outstanding natural wonders of the world. I am unwilling to pass to a description of the park without paying my respectful tribute and presenting the compliments of the State of New Mexico to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON], who has always maintained so active an interest in New Mexico affairs.

In this year's appropriation bill the Congress has appropriated nearly \$200,000 with which to build a passenger elevator, with a capacity of 100 people, to be used by visitors in leaving the caverns. It is not thought necessary to use the elevator for entry to the caverns, but rather for exit only, as otherwise a great part of the admirable impression of this scenic marvel would be lost. Excellent highways lead to the caverns; first-class efficiently operated hotels are plentiful at Carlsbad, Roswell, and other near-by cities, and the popularity of the caverns is so great, the number of visitors has so substantially increased

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on May 7, 1930, the President approved and signed a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 305. Joint resolution providing for the participation by the United States in the International Conference on Load Lines to be held in London, England, in 1930.

PERMISSION TO SIT DURING SESSIONS OF HOUSE

Mr. HALL of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the Judiciary I ask unanimous consent that that committee may sit during the sessions of the House next Thursday and Friday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12236) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for other purposes. Pending that, I ask unanimous consent that the time for debate be controlled by and divided equally between the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AYRES] and myself. In view of the rather uncertain demand for time, I suggest that we do not fix a time limit for general debate until later.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Idaho moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the naval appropriation bill. Pending that, he asks unanimous consent that the time for general debate be controlled by and divided equally between the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AYRES] and himself. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Idaho that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the naval appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the naval appropriation bill, with Mr. HOCH in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL].

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I was very much interested in reading this morning a speech delivered yesterday by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANKFORD], which I suppose was very largely for home consumption and for the purpose of informing the people of his district of the many good things he had done for them and why he should be renominated and reelected to Congress. I have no objection to any of the statements made as far as his district is concerned, but I do want to call attention of the House to some of the reasons given and the good things that have been done and what he has done himself as an individual Member to help along those good things. From the first part of his speech I quote the following:

Members here can only do their best and be true, and when a good piece of legislation is enacted or a bad bill defeated we can only say "we helped."

Also the following:

A few days ago some of my friends said I was to be congratulated for securing for my district in the river and harbor bill passed last month more authorizations than was ever written in a previous similar bill.

I want the country to know that that river and harbor bill was presided over by a Republican chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEMPSEY], and that the whole committee is controlled by the Republicans, because they have more members on it than the Democrats. I have no fault to find with his statement about rivers and harbors, for he probably voted for the bill, as everyone else did. I am very glad that our committee in the House is giving to each section of the country the things that that

section is entitled to. That is the kind of legislation we should promote here—generous and just legislation for every part of the country, regardless of whether it is North, South, East, or West.

I quote again from the gentleman's speech:

Mr. Chairman, again my friends said I was to be congratulated upon securing for the first time, in the present tariff bill, a duty upon turpentine, long-staple cotton, tar and pitch of wood, as well as an increase on peanuts and various other farm products, and I said, "No, I only helped wherever I found a chance."

I want the gentleman to show me any place where he has even helped when he found the chance.

I will tell the people of Georgia and the people of the country just how much he helped to give them this protection on the articles produced in Georgia, and higher protection on farm products.

When we had the conference report, agreed on by the conferees of both the Senate and the House, the report that contained the very protection on the articles he is congratulating himself and his people on having, he voted against that report; and, if I have not made any mistake, every other member of the Georgia delegation did the same.

That is how he and his delegation helped their people to get the protection they wanted.

And I want to say to the gentleman and to his colleagues from Georgia that if the Members of the New York delegation and the Pennsylvania delegation had taken the same position that he took, and had not voted for the conference report, the item he is bragging about as being of benefit to his constituents would not have been passed or agreed to, as far as this House is concerned.

Now, I have no argument or dispute with any man in this House in regard to protection, whether he is for it or against it; but I do not want any man to stand on the floor of the House and say what he has done for his people in respect to protection for products raised in his State and then vote against the bill that protects those products, largely because it contains some protection for some other part of the country. I have no use, politically, for any man who tries to get the highest possible protection on the products of his own section, and prays for enough Republican votes to pass the bill, while he votes against it. I not only call that man a poor protectionist, but a very untrue spokesman.

I am not a spot protectionist. I am for protection for any article produced in this country that really needs protection, and the gentleman from Georgia and others should either be that kind of protectionist or else not brag on the floor of the House regarding the protection for home industry that he had helped put in the bill, when he voted against the report that assured that protection. I hope the gentleman from Georgia will give my remarks the same publicity he gives his own. [Applause.]

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, tremendous interest centers around the naval program of the United States on account of the London Naval Conference and the prospective results that may flow therefrom.

From the standpoint of the National Budget we are concerned with factors that will enter into the program between now and 1936, the beginnings of which are involved, in minor degree, in the bill that we are now reporting, but which, for the most part, will affect the appropriation bills for the succeeding fiscal years following 1931 up to 1936.

Your committee in reporting the bill for 1931 has been compelled to bear in mind that the London treaty has not been adopted by the United States or by any other power, and that so far as nations are concerned the program is still a tentative program. Thus we have not been permitted to take into consideration all the money factors that have bearing upon certain items that may be avoided in event of ratification, and which can be met by wise administration.

In view, however, of the possibility that the proposed naval programs of nations will be radically modified as a result of the London Conference, it will be my purpose in my opening statement to indicate the broad purposes of the pending bill, the manner in which the provisions of the bill will fit into possible naval programs, and the effect upon naval programs of our country and of the world should the London tentative agreement be ratified by the several powers.

The preliminary estimates from the bureau chiefs for the fiscal year 1931, which were prepared about nine months ago, aggregated \$471,103,274. These estimates were reduced by the Secretary of the Navy and submitted to the Budget in the terms of \$425,084,297, and in addition contract authorization for airplane purchases was asked in the amount of \$10,000,000.

Through discussions with the Bureau of the Budget this total figure was reduced until the estimates that have come to the Congress for the next fiscal year, original and supplemental, are in the figures \$380,598,226. Further supplemental estimates probably will be presented.

Your committee has conducted extensive hearings and has been able to omit \$1,710,590 carried in the Budget and reports the bill to the House in the figures \$379,036,086, inclusive of authorization in the amount of \$2,000,000 that may be drawn from the Navy supply account fund. In addition to this, contract authorization for aircraft is carried in the amount of \$10,000,000. The grand total of direct and indirect appropriations for the present fiscal year is \$365,685,027, in addition to which contract authorization exists on account of aircraft in the amount of \$10,000,000, the same as we propose for 1931.

I have no doubt that before the fiscal year will have been concluded, several additional million dollars will need to be added, but I am speaking of the appropriations and authorizations that have been made up to the present.

Upon that basis, appropriations for 1931 are \$13,351,059 over and above the appropriations for 1930.

Of such sum, \$6,950,000 is on account of the capital-ship major overhaul program. It happens that the appropriation for initiating the work on the two vessels now undergoing modernization was made well along in the fiscal year 1929, although work was not commenced until the first of the fiscal year 1930. Consequently, in drawing a comparison between next year and this we might eliminate very appropriately from consideration the increase occasioned by the item and circumstances mentioned. So doing, the increase is actually \$6,401,059. Notwithstanding the fact that the Budget and bill are premised upon a fleet and personnel of practically current year proportions, the committee finds it necessary, despite the reductions it is recommending aggregating the sum of \$1,710,590, to propose increases in a number of directions netting the sum indicated. Personnel, even though there be no marked fluctuations, will be found annually to cost more under present laws applying to pay. Other major factors are (1) aviation, although the increase proposed under such head is but \$603,211, (2) a larger outlay for public works, including repair and maintenance, and (3) new ship construction, all of which I shall refer to later.

With respect to the fleet, now, as a year ago, we find that there is not a proper balance between the ships it is planned to have in commission and funds estimated for their operation, repair, and improvement. There should be closer if not complete harmony touching these factors, and the committee feels that the department should make such adjustments as available funds may require to bring them into closer accord.

Unless upon administrative discretion following ratification of the London treaty, reductions were to be made in officer and enlisted personnel of both the Navy and the Marine Corps and in the craft that would be maintained in operation, the Naval Establishment in 1931 in these regards will remain approximately the same as the Naval Establishment for 1930. No radical changes will be made in the activities that normally will go forward under operation and maintenance, engineering, construction and repair, the Naval Reserve, yards and docks, public works, aeronautics, or the activities pertaining to the Marine Corps.

I believe the House would prefer, in this general statement, that I defer discussion of particular features pertaining to the varied activities of the Navy until they may be reached under the 5-minute rule.

Probably I should make a brief statement touching modernization and new construction work upon naval craft.

MODERNIZATION OF CAPITAL SHIPS

For completing the modernization of the battleships *Pennsylvania* and *Arizona*, the bill carries \$7,400,000, which is the sum remaining to be appropriated under the authorization for such work.

The capital ship modernization program was begun in August, 1925. Including the *Pennsylvania* and *Arizona*, which it is expected will be ready to join the fleet in March, 1931, there will have been modernized in the space of about five and one-half years 10 of our 18 capital ships, at a total cost of about \$48,110,000.

INCREASE OF THE NAVY

For the present fiscal year there was appropriated toward the construction of new vessels a total of \$48,350,000, which includes \$2,000,000 of naval supply account funds. In addition, \$200,000 was made available for additional machinery and equipment at ordnance establishments, and \$570,000 was appropriated to initiate a program of navy yard development for

ship construction calling for a total outlay for yard improvements of \$1,795,000. For the several objects, therefore, the total sum made available was \$49,120,000.

Of the sum for ship construction, \$36,750,000 was on account of vessels authorized prior to February 13, 1929, and \$11,600,000 on account of the aircraft carrier and 10 of the 15 cruisers authorized in the act approved on such date, divided between such latter vessels as follows:

| | |
|--|--------------|
| First block of five light cruisers..... | \$10,300,000 |
| Second block of five light cruisers..... | 200,000 |
| Aircraft carrier..... | 1,100,000 |

For 1931 the Budget proposes to make available a total of \$49,800,000 for shipbuilding, of which \$14,550,000 is intended to be applied to vessels authorized prior to the new program act and \$35,250,000 to vessels comprising the new program.

At this point I desire to submit to the House a table that will show the status of all new construction work, as the estimates were submitted to the committee by the Bureau of the Budget, and which, of course, were submitted prior to the London Naval Conference.

| | Appropriations proposed, 1931 bill | | | Remaining to be appropriated after July 1, 1931 |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------|------------|---|
| | Construction and machinery | Ordnance | Total | |
| Submarine V-4..... | \$200,000 | ----- | \$200,000 | ----- |
| Submarines V-5 and V-6..... | 2,700,000 | ----- | 2,700,000 | ----- |
| Submarines V-7, V-8, and V-9..... | 4,600,000 | ----- | 4,600,000 | \$6,900,000 |
| Light cruisers 28, 29, and 31..... | 7,050,000 | ----- | 7,050,000 | 800,000 |
| New cruiser program: | | | | |
| First block of 5..... | 20,800,000 | \$10,100,000 | 30,900,000 | 41,100,000 |
| Second block of 5..... | ----- | 200,000 | 200,000 | 82,100,000 |
| Third block of 5..... | 200,000 | 400,000 | 600,000 | 82,100,000 |
| Aircraft carrier..... | 3,450,000 | 300,000 | 3,750,000 | 14,150,000 |
| Total..... | 39,000,000 | 10,800,000 | 49,800,000 | 227,150,000 |

An examination of the table shows that provision is made for the third block of five 8-inch gun cruisers that were authorized a year and a half ago. The total cost of these five cruisers was planned to be \$82,500,000.

Should the London treaty be adopted the entire amount will be subtracted from the totals.

It will be noted, however, that while \$82,500,000 is involved in the construction of these five cruisers, since they are in the third block of the 15-cruiser program, only a small amount was recommended to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1931, namely, \$400,000. Your committee has subtracted this amount from the bill.

Members of the House will recall also that the proposed London treaty provides that three of the second block of 8-inch gun cruisers be laid down—one in 1933, one in 1934, and one in 1935. This being the case, money that had been recommended by the Bureau of the Budget for commencement of the work upon these three craft will not be expended thereon. It happens, however, that the amount recommended on five of the second block of cruisers was an amount taken in conjunction with the sum previously appropriated which would be adequate for commencement only—an amount, all told, of \$400,000. Since two of the cruisers in the second group of five are to be commenced during the coming fiscal year, your committee did not feel justified in disturbing this figure, as in any event it will suffice for a bare commencement of the work.

To sum up, for 1931 for new construction work, your committee recommends a total of \$49,400,000.

RESULTS OF THE LONDON NAVAL CONFERENCE

The results of the London Naval Conference can be summarized as, first, definite limitation in all categories of ships of the three powers, including limitation in aircraft carrier tonnage of units of less than 10,000 tons displacement; second, extension of replacement dates of capital ships; third, retirement of three capital ships for the United States and five for Great Britain; and, finally, definite provision that omission upon the part of a nation to build within a time provided within which construction could be had shall not be regarded as forfeiting the amount of tonnage postponed by such nation.

Just what money savings may accrue to the several powers or to the United States as a result of the conference in event of ratification of the treaty involves the fundamental question of whether or not the highest interests of our country and the world may be served by pursuing a moderate program within the limits laid down or by building up to the limit of authorization in all categories.

At this point I desire to place in the RECORD a table that will show the tonnage of the three great powers—the United States, Great Britain, and Japan—at the time the conference convened and as it will be authorized under the proposed agreement.

Tonnage built, building, appropriated for, or fixed by Washington conference as of January 15, 1930, contrasted with tonnage under London conference agreement

[Data for January 15, 1930, from data sheet compiled by Office of Naval Intelligence, except authorization for aircraft carriers, which is taken from Washington treaty; data for London conference is from statement of President Hoover of April 11, 1930, and from apparently authentic press dispatches]

| | United States | | Great Britain | | Japan | |
|------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| | Tonnage, Jan. 15, 1930 | London conference agreement | Tonnage, Jan. 15, 1930 | London conference agreement | Tonnage, Jan. 15, 1930 | London conference agreement |
| Battleships..... | 523,400 | ¹ 460,000 | 606,450 | ¹ 460,000 | 292,000 | ¹ 264,900 |
| Aircraft carriers..... | ² 135,000 | 135,000 | ² 135,000 | 135,000 | ⁴ 81,000 | 81,000 |
| Cruisers..... | 250,500 | | 406,911 | | 206,815 | |
| 8-inch guns..... | | ³ 180,000 | | ³ 150,000 | | ⁷ 108,450 |
| 6-inch guns..... | | ³ 143,500 | | ³ 189,000 | | 100,450 |
| Destroyers..... | ¹² 260,304 | 150,000 | 196,761 | 150,000 | 129,375 | 105,500 |
| Submarines..... | 87,232 | 52,700 | 69,201 | 52,700 | 78,497 | 52,700 |
| | ¹ 1,286,436 | 1,121,200 | ¹⁰ 1,414,323 | 1,136,700 | ¹¹ 788,087 | 713,000 |

¹ About.

² 90,036 tons, built and building.

³ 115,350 tons, built and building.

⁴ 68,870 tons, built and building.

⁵ 18 cruisers.

⁶ 15 cruisers.

⁷ 12 cruisers.

⁸ These figures for United States and Great Britain are interchangeable.

⁹ Exclusive of 47,598 tons of craft in service but over effective age. Exclusive of 89,915 tons of craft listed for disposal.

¹⁰ Exclusive of 1,695 tons of craft in service but over effective age.

¹¹ Exclusive of 69,160 tons of craft in service but over effective age.

¹² Includes 61 destroyers (63,991 tons) listed for disposal.

CERTAIN DIRECT SAVINGS

From an examination of the table it will appear that as a result of the London conference certain tonnage increases are made possible and certain reductions in tonnage required. Let us consider both factors.

Direct money savings may be made as a result of the action of the conference, assuming treaty ratification. In the first place, as to battleships, the elimination of three battleships from the fleet of the United States is, in itself, no negligible item, and should result in a saving, in maintenance and operation costs alone, for each ship amounting to more than \$2,000,000 for each year they otherwise would have remained in service.

Again, the measure provides for the extension of all battleship replacement dates until 1936. Within that time, were the United States to replace ships that she could replace under the Washington treaty, she would replace five completely; and five more would be in process of replacement, all of which, upon the basis of \$37,500,000 per ship would make a total of \$281,250,000, which would be needed between now and 1936. No one can state to-day that that is an absolute saving. It is a postponement. But, by 1936, it may well be that as a result of the conference which will meet the year before, or in 1935, battleships will be entirely eliminated or their numbers reduced to such an extent that the entire amount of \$281,250,000 now postponed may be saved to the Treasury of the United States, and with corresponding saving to other countries. Other direct savings will be made through the scrapping of certain destroyer and submarine tonnage.

WHAT WOULD WE NEED TO DO IN NEW CONSTRUCTION WORK AND MAINTENANCE OF ESTABLISHMENT UNDER THE TREATY?

The question that is asked over and over is, What will be the effect of the London treaty, assuming there may be ratification, upon the pending programs and the maintenance of naval establishments?

At once the proponents of ever-increasing navies who have been antagonistic to any limitation of armaments, who have urged in season and out of season that the United States should determine the size of its own Naval Establishment, regardless of other powers, are now urging that under the terms of the London treaty it would be the duty of the United States and of every other nation party to the treaty to carry forward construction programs up to the entire limit of authorization in the several categories. Some very earnest people take this point of view, but, on the other hand, it is the position of all those who consciously or unconsciously have personal interests to serve.

In view of the tremendous interest in this phase of the question, I shall address myself to it specifically.

The outstanding features of the London naval agreement is the limit that has been fixed upon tonnage of the several types. Friends of limitation regret that it was not possible for lower limits to have been attained. The fact, however, that limits were attained that on the whole fix possible tonnage at a figure below the present tonnage of nations is cause for gratitude. The fixation of construction within categories will remove competition in the vicious sense that has prevailed during past years.

But what is meant by limitation? Does it mean building up to the limit in all categories? Does it mean that there is imposed upon nations an obligation to maintain at all times and regardless of circumstances what some are pleased to call "treaty navies"?

PRACTICE UNDER WASHINGTON TREATY

Immediately following the Washington conference, the question of the obligation of the United States under the terms of the treaty resulting therefrom became a subject of earnest debate. It will be recalled that that treaty fixed a limitation upon capital ship and aircraft carrier tonnage. It will be recalled that, as to the former, replacement dates were prescribed touching various battleships prior to which replacement might not occur, these dates varying with the different countries and having regard for the age of ships to be replaced.

The proponents of ever-increasing naval establishments urged at once that unless nations built up to the authorizations and at the time of the replacement dates they would lose the right to build. From that date until now they have been urging that the limitations recited in the treaty of Washington imposed obligations of construction as well as obligations not to construct prior to fixed dates.

It has been my constant thought and my earnest contention that every nation party to the agreement assumed an obligation not to build beyond the limitations imposed as to tonnage or in advance of the time within which certain craft might be laid down, but that no obligation, direct or by implication, was imposed upon any nation to build other than according to a course that would have regard for its own national needs.

Consider for a moment what has been the attitude of nations upon this subject.

As for battleships, only two nations have reached the time when replacement could be had in tonnage other than the replacement that was in process or immediately to be undertaken upon the conclusion of the Washington treaty. Great Britain was given the privilege of completing certain craft and withdrawing five of her older battleships and cruisers that she had at the time of the Washington treaty. This she did. The United States was given the privilege of completing two battleships which were under construction and withdrawing four of the older ones that she possessed in 1922 and which were to continue as part of her fleet until the new ones had been added. A like adjustment was made for Japan.

The dates for the large replacement programs, however, for all nations were ahead.

The United States, Great Britain, and Japan, in the absence of the London conference, were not to reach their replacement dates until 1931. In that year Great Britain was to have been privileged to lay down 2 battleships, the United States 2, and Japan 1.

There were two other nations parties to the treaty—France and Italy. Replacement dates for each of these nations occurred for two battleships in 1927 and 1929, respectively—the battleships that could have been replaced in those years for each nation having an aggregate tonnage of 70,000 tons. Yet neither France nor Italy interpreted the treaty to mean that an obligation was imposed to build and neither nation laid down the craft permitted.

But it is urged by those who insist upon building up to treaty limitations that other nations that are parties to the treaty are interested, and not alone the nation that does not desire to build upon a given time.

I then submit in answer that Great Britain, the United States, or Japan did not protest to either France or Italy that those nations were violating the Washington treaty through failure to build in 1927 and in 1929.

If they are correct who contend that France and Italy were obligated to build, it follows that the other parties to the treaty—the United States, Great Britain, and Japan—were guilty themselves of negligence in failure to remind France and Italy of their solemn covenants to replace their battleships when they saw that these nations were neglecting so to do. No such protests were made. I submit there was no such obligation.

At the London conference, however, both France and Italy assumed that they had not lost their right to lay down the craft that could have been laid down in 1927 and 1929, and their position was frankly and freely conceded by the conference.

Now, turn to aircraft carriers.

The five powers who were parties to the Washington agreement were allocated tonnage as follows:

| | Tons |
|-----------------------------|---------|
| United States..... | 135,000 |
| Great Britain..... | 135,000 |
| Japan..... | 81,000 |
| France and Italy, each..... | 60,000 |

But what have nations done? Eight years have passed since the Washington conference was concluded, and yet since that time the United States has completed but two carriers, the *Lexington* and the *Saratoga*, with a tonnage of 66,000 tons and has barely begun a third of 13,800 tons. Great Britain is far short of her allocated tonnage, and much of the tonnage that she now has is so obsolete that she could be justified in replacing it. This is likewise true of Japan. France has little more than one-third of her aircraft tonnage and Italy has none at all.

THE LONDON TREATY LANGUAGE

In deference to the uncertainty that has existed or that has been urged to exist touching the Washington treaty in this regard, the London naval agreement specifically recites, "The right of replacement is not lost by delay in laying down replacement tonnage." (Annex 1, sec. 1.) Obviously, the language of the proposed London treaty makes clear that a limitation does not carry with it a mandate to build under penalty of forfeiture of right to build.

What, then, shall we say as to policy?

Cardinal in the reason for justification of navies is national and world-wide security. Limitations themselves for tonnage go far toward solving the problem of security. Assurance through these limitations is given that rival nations will not build craft of a certain type or of all types in excess of defined tonnage. It thus becomes the privilege, the opportunity, if you please, of nations to take this factor into account in formulating their naval programs.

If this be true, it follows that nations may have regard for elements that in the past under competitive building had to be ignored:

First. Financial burdens and national budgets;

Second. The problem of an even load in navy yards.

Third. The effect new building or replacement will have upon craft of the several types in comparison with the craft that other nations will have when the limitation conference of 1935 or other earlier conference may be held.

Fourth. The actual need from the standpoint of defense modified as will be this need by moderation of other nations.

FINANCIAL BURDENS AND NATIONAL BUDGETS

From the standpoint of burdens that are reflected through taxation that rest upon the peoples of the great world powers, it must be remembered that last year the organized military powers of the world, including reserves of the several powers aggregated nearly 30,000,000 men. This burden calls for stupendous money costs. It must be remembered that during that same period the naval budgets of the United States, Great Britain, Japan, France, and Italy were close on to \$1,000,000,000. It must be remembered that the naval burden alone for the United States was more than \$374,000,000. This year it is greater. It can not be disputed that 72 per cent of the annual expenditures of the United States is on account of past wars or the maintenance of Military and Naval Establishments. More than that, these burdens are mounting.

I shall pass over expenses incurred in Military Establishments other than the Navy, but as to the Navy I desire to direct the attention of the House to the tremendous expanse of naval burdens upon the world's great powers as they have gone forward during the last 25 years.

Naval appropriations of leading world powers

| | Fiscal year | | Increase (+) or decrease (-) |
|--------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------------------------|
| | 1904 | 1929 | |
| United States..... | \$109,196,123 | \$374,008,054 | +265,411,931 |
| Great Britain..... | 173,648,058 | 278,478,000 | +104,929,942 |
| Japan..... | 17,533,279 | 131,222,722 | +113,689,443 |
| France..... | 59,740,222 | 99,568,000 | +39,827,778 |
| Italy..... | 23,822,400 | 63,622,982 | +40,100,582 |
| Germany..... | 50,544,000 | 47,764,019 | -2,779,981 |
| Russia..... | 60,018,895 | 42,329,289 | -17,689,606 |

Mr. Chairman, with due regard for the obligation that legislative bodies owe to their constituencies, with due regard for

the sacrifice that must be made by the millions of people in all countries of not only comforts of life but in some instances bare necessities, regard must be had for ways that will mean reduction of burdens of government.

It is possible to give a fair outline of what the proposed London treaty will cost the United States in money, provided we insist upon building up to the limitations within the treaty and construe the limitations as an obligation to build.

Turning to battleships, it would mean that the three that are to be decommissioned would be kept in full commission to the last day possible under the terms of the treaty—one year in the case of two ships and 18 months in the case of the other.

It would mean an urge to permit reckless expenditure under the guise of modernization upon any or all of the remaining battleships.

It would mean an obligation to construct 69,000 tons of aircraft carriers.

It would mean an obligation not only to construct all the 8-inch gun cruisers that the treaty permits but in addition 73,000 tons of the 6-inch gun cruisers over and above what we have to-day.

In the matter of destroyers it would be possible to replace 150,000 tons and between 20,000 and 25,000 tons of submarines.

More than that, it would be possible, and, of course, those who are urging the ever-expanding program would insist that it is necessary, to provide one-fourth of our 6-inch gun cruisers with landing decks for aircraft. By implication we would need to add possibly 2,000 airplanes to our aircraft program in order to supply the airplanes that would be necessary for aircraft carriers and the aviation complements possessed by other types.

Rough estimates of what this building program would cost run from \$750,000,000 to \$1,000,000,000 between now and 1936. That period of time is little more than six years. It would mean an annual naval construction program of \$125,000,000 to \$150,000,000 for the United States for fighting types of craft.

From the standpoint of national finances, I submit, there can be no justification for any such expenditure of money, an expenditure that would treble the appropriations that we have made for new construction work on an average for each of the last 10 years.

Do gentlemen hail the London conference as a success, who see only that it means multiplying in this enormous fashion the cost of naval armaments? It would be a perversion of the magnificent work of President Hoover and Prime Minister MacDonald, and the able delegates to the London conference, to transform a limitations agreement into a mandate for expansion programs.

But, Mr. Chairman, that is not all that would be involved. Fighting craft mean auxiliary craft. Fighting craft mean expansion in navy yards. Fighting craft mean personnel, both officer and enlisted personnel. The expansion of the Navy of the United States to the limits that would be possible were that to be the interpretation of the London treaty would mean the increase of annual burden of naval appropriations from an average of about \$350,000,000 annually, as it has been during the last eight years, to an annual cost of between \$500,000,000 and \$600,000,000.

Members of Congress can not flatter themselves that the only additional expense is in the construction of ships. "It is not the original cost; it is the upkeep." If we are to have ships, the ships will need to be operated, and the figures that I have given you, in my judgment, are conservative rather than overestimates.

Scientists tell us that the old fable of the ostrich burying his head in the sand at the approach of danger is a libel upon that bird of the desert. Whether or not it is true, Members of Congress and citizens of our country must not bury their heads in the sand and blind themselves to the expense that is ahead with construction of ships, the vast sums that will be necessary for operation and maintenance of such craft.

What I have said with respect to this program for the United States, applies with like force from the standpoint of Great Britain and the standpoint of Japan.

THE PROBLEM OF AN EVEN LOAD IN THE NAVY YARDS

One of the most serious problems that confronts your committee in the preparation of the Navy bill, is the problem of an even load in the navy yards of our country. This problem is of tremendous importance from several points of view.

First, it is important from the standpoint of navy-yard employees.

We have in the navy yards of the United States approximately 40,000 workmen. These workmen are of a high type. They are skilled; they are efficient; they will take their places by the side of the finest workmen in industrial yards of our country

or of any other land. Most of them are men who take seriously the problems of life. Most of them are men of families. They are interested in filling the positions that are given them and in earning the wage by which they may support the wife, the children, the home.

They are entitled to definite employment to the extent that it is possible for our country to anticipate an even load of work.

This problem is one that in our rapidly advancing industrial age is attracting the attention, not only of men and women who, from humanitarian standpoint alone are seeking to make better the conditions of workmen and their families throughout our land, but from the standpoint of employers of labor and their responsibility for the success of great industrial concerns.

Within the last few months, intensive studies have been made in industrial lines looking to maintenance of the even load of employment. Great railroad companies are working out such programs and are employing industrial engineers to assist them in the tasks to the end that the men in the great railroad centers may be employed the year around.

Automobile factories, rubber tire factories, manufacturing establishments of a variety of character are concentrating their efforts upon this important subject. Our Government should do no less as it undertakes the roll of employer of labor.

Limitations within the treaty ought to be accepted by the Congress and the country as giving additional authority to those charged with responsibility to approach this subject with the finest regard to the humanities that are involved. We ought not to be driven on to rapid expansion in navy yards, rapid construction work in order to keep up to a certain figure that was intended as a limitation.

Second. It is important from the standpoint of normal building programs that we be not driven on to rapid expansion of our navy yards.

When employees in navy yards see an approaching end of employment, they recognize that unless new work be provided plants must be shut down and activities cease. At once campaigns are undertaken that enlist the sympathy of local chambers of commerce, local service clubs of all kinds, humanitarian groups, and they appeal to Congress to do something that will prevent the employees of navy yards from being thrown out of work. It becomes not a question of national need; it becomes not a question of naval defense; it becomes a question, pure and simple, of the building of something, no matter what, that men who have worked may continue to hold their jobs.

Of course, this means a terrific campaign for the expansion of naval programs.

It necessarily follows that either from the standpoint of men who are employed, or from the standpoint of actual naval needs, the limitations feature of the London conference ought not to be construed as a mandate.

NEW SHIPS TO SCRAP

The effect of new building upon ability of the United States to be most effective in the next naval conference is a matter of grave importance. Consider the question from the standpoint of the power of the United States to assist in determining a course in the conference that may be held in five or six years from now if we go ahead and by 1935 build up to the limits laid down in the London conference. According to rough estimates that I believe are fairly accurate, it would mean expending during the next five or six years from three-quarters of a billion to one billion dollars. This money would be invested in new craft. Added to that would be no less than another quarter of a billion dollars on account of craft that have been completed within the last three or four years—cruisers, submarines, aircraft carriers. What position would the United States be in as her delegates would sit down to the conference table if we were forced to admit that we had this enormous tonnage of new craft of the several categories? Public opinion might hesitate to place approval upon destroying craft that had only recently been completed. Here alone would be an element that would need to be considered and which was a potent factor in shaping some of the policies in both the Washington and London conferences. On the other hand, if we could approach the conference with considerable tonnage to our credit in the several categories that remained unbuild and other nations could approach the conference in like fashion, it would be reasonable for nations to say, "Let us draw a pencil through the blue prints. Let us scrap old craft that will need to be scrapped within a year or a few years, and let us reduce the general level within the several categories." From the standpoint of strategy, looking to further international reduction of armaments, this is the right course. Those who do not want to reduce all tonnage to lower levels at the next naval conference will demand that we build up to the topmost figures.

NEW CRAFT SHOULD NOT BE OBSOLETE

But there is another consideration. Suppose at the time the next conference were to convene we were to find ourselves with complete tonnage in aircraft carriers of certain types or in 6-inch gun cruisers and in submarines. It might well be that in five years from now it would be very apparent that the type of aircraft carrier that now seems admirable and that would be built if we were to complete our program up to the tonnage limit by 1935 would be obsolete.

It might be that cruisers, although new, would be obsolete by reason of new and more recent developments, as, for instance, improvements that may be suggested by the two ships that are being built by Germany. It may well be that the submarine will become so vulnerable by reason of devices for their location that no nation will want to continue their use from that point of view alone. The delegates from the United States to the conference would then be in position of scrapping new ships in order to replace them by more efficient ones or else seeing our Nation possessed of obsolescent craft, though but a few years old, while other nations, who may have chosen to be more conservative in the matter of building under the limitation provisions or who may have chosen to defer replacement, would be in position to build at that time new craft of the latest and approved tonnage.

Pursuing this same thought, may I now direct the attention of the House to a somewhat similar situation that might be embarrassing if a rush program of naval construction in all categories were to be adopted by reason of the provision of the treaty were a nation to find itself compelled to build new tonnage to meet tonnage upon the part of some nontreaty power that might threaten security.

I do not believe that such a contingency will arise, but were it to develop, a program of moderation in building would permit the United States to take needed advantage of such contingency under building that would be permitted within the so-called "escalator" provision of the treaty, that would be more nearly in harmony with our national needs, and which we might not take if we felt that we had excessive tonnage in other types.

NEED FROM THE STANDPOINT OF DEFENSE

The limitation provision of the treaty should give the United States and every other nation the privilege of laying down construction programs in line with the actual defense needs of the respective nations. Indeed, this has been the final interpretation, in spite of propagandists, upon the less exacting language of the Washington treaty. France and Italy omitted to lay down two battleships each. Why? Because national needs did not require them to assume this enormous expense. The United States and all the other powers have been most conservative in their aircraft-carrier construction programs, notwithstanding authorization of the Washington treaty, because national defense did not require the enormous outlay of money upon ships of this type. Oh, some one will say the reason delay was possible was because nations were waiting to take advantage of new improvements. This does not answer the question. The fact remains that had there been national need all of the nations would have proceeded upon the basis of the known facts and would have built aircraft carriers of the types that they were permitted to build. More than that, if nations may feel that new construction programs are not required, as would be required through a mandate, but that the limitation features give discretion to nations as to time and tonnage within those limitations, nations will have regard for what other nations are doing in construction programs in the several categories. If nation A sees that nation B is following a conservative policy, nation A may wish to follow that policy. On the other hand, if nation A sees nation B constructing ships up to the limit of the possibilities under the treaty, nation A will do likewise.

In 1817 there was adopted by the United States and Great Britain a treaty known as the Rush-Bagot treaty, which defines the rights of the respective powers to maintain craft upon the Great Lakes and Lake Champlain. It provides that upon Lake Champlain each nation may retain 1 craft of 200 tons; upon Lake Ontario each nation 1 craft of 200 tons; and upon the other Great Lakes, which at that time were connected from the standpoint of navigational facilities, 2 craft of 200 tons each. That treaty is in force to-day. But we do not have such craft upon Lake Champlain and Lake Ontario and the Great Lakes as contemplated by the treaty; neither does Great Britain.

The fact of the business is, common sense was applied in the interpretation of the treaty, and actual living conditions under the treaty have made it possible for a relationship of the highest good will and accord to exist between the United States and Canada—a relationship that does not need armaments and naval craft to justify or to make more secure. Indeed, here is a re-

lationship that would be rendered less secure by craft upon the Lakes that separate these two mighty powers and by forts and garrisons and officers and men throughout the other 2,000 miles of boundary line between the Atlantic and the Pacific.

The illustration is significant of what can occur under the London treaty. Under that treaty we are looking forward to another conference in 1935. It will aid further naval reduction if, when 1935 may be reached, nations may not find themselves with navies of new craft that they would need to destroy in order to obtain reductions in tonnage in the several categories. More than that, a conference would be more ready to approach the question with five or six years of international cooperation looking to the lessening of the burdens of armaments and the removal of causes for war than if, upon the approach of the conference, all of the parties thereto will be armed cap-a-pie to the extent that they would be permitted to do if they took advantage of every grant of authorization under the London treaty.

Finally, from the standpoint of good business, from the standpoint of strategy, as we shall sit down to the next conference table we ought to regard the limitations within the London treaty as a privilege rather than a mandate; a privilege that will permit the United States to be conservative in later programs of new construction work, to iron out an even load of construction in her navy yards, to take advantage of the latest that may be devised by our people or the people of any other lands in types or in features pertaining to efficiency, and that will permit us to have a most effective voice in encouraging still further reductions of naval armaments when it may be demonstrated more definitely than it was at the London conference that through international discussion and understanding of the problems of nations differences may be settled and naval and military burdens reduced.

I shall be glad to yield at this time to my colleague from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN].

Mr. BRITTEN. There are some things I would like to have clarified. The gentleman, in concluding his remarks, opposed the intent of the London treaty, as I understood it.

Mr. FRENCH. The gentleman must have misunderstood me. I am for the London treaty.

Mr. BRITTEN. The gentleman inferred, in connection with the treaty, that we should not build up to the treaty requirements. If he said that, is he talking for himself or the administration?

Mr. FRENCH. In anything I may say here, I shall express my personal views.

Mr. BRITTEN. The gentleman is chairman of the committee and is in touch with the various departments, particularly the department having to administer this particular bill, and is supposed to express the sentiments of the department.

Mr. FRENCH. Would the gentleman say that that is what he had in mind when he introduced his bill? [Applause.]

Mr. BRITTEN. I thank the gentleman for that thought. Yes; all the figures in my bill were received from the Secretary of the Navy, every figure and every dollar in my bill authorizing appropriations to meet the requirements of the London treaty.

Mr. FRENCH. Does the gentleman mean to say that it is the thought of the administration that a bill along the lines he has introduced, carrying all the obligations involved in the money total, carrying the program of construction up to the limit—is that the policy the administration has approved? Does he want the House to understand that?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes, I do; and if that is not correct, then the administration would never have agreed to the signing of the London treaty. Where does the gentleman think I got that mass of figures? They came from the Navy Department.

Mr. FRENCH. There are two questions—one question whether or not the administration wants to build up to the limit of the treaty, and another question whether the treaty may be ratified with the thought of sound discretion in our country to build according to the national needs.

Mr. BRITTEN. That is what the gentleman is contending for, and I agree with the gentleman that Congress ought to build up to the national needs as they appear from time to time. That is correct.

Mr. FRENCH. And the gentleman says the national needs demand the gross tonnage that we can build at any time in all categories.

Mr. BRITTEN. No; the gentleman does not say that and he does not mean it. The gentleman means this—that we are carrying on the high seas to-day about seventeen thousand million dollars' worth of commerce per annum. We think that commerce is entitled to the same protection that the British commerce is entitled to all over the world. It does not make any

difference whether our manufactures are carried in Dutch, Italian, British, or American bottoms—they are entitled to the same measure of protection. The difference between the gentleman and myself is that the gentleman has suggested to the House that while we have made an agreement in London for tonnage and certain categories, it is not necessary to live up to it.

Mr. FRENCH. What I tried to impress upon the House is the problem of determining whether or not we should build up to treaty limitations regardless of national needs, or if national defense permit, pursue a conservative course for the next five years and have regard for the economies involved.

Mr. BRITTEN. That is true, and does not the gentleman believe that the President of the United States had that very condition in mind when he agreed to this treaty in London?

Mr. FRENCH. I should hope he had in mind the thought that I have outlined, rather than the thought that seems the implication from the gentleman's statement, and the gentleman's bill, which I understand he is about to introduce.

Mr. BRITTEN. I have already introduced the bill. It is based on figures received from the department, and the types of ships of the various categories, as specified by a chart that was very, very carefully prepared by the Navy Department, which indicates to my mind that the present administration has every intention in the world of living up to the requirements of that treaty, and I hope that it does. The gentleman and I will not argue the treaty any further, but let me ask the gentleman another question to clarify his remarks.

The gentleman stated in his remarks that a certain appropriation had been recommended for the second group of five cruisers, but of course we will not immediately require all 10 cruisers, but only 7 for the time being, and then the last 3 will be appropriated for in 1933, 1934, and 1935. In his remarks the gentleman said that the amounts which should have gone to all 5 were transferred to the remaining 2. I am wondering if that is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho has used one hour.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I shall proceed for 10 minutes more. I want to be understood as saying that for the second bloc \$200,000 of new money was carried in the estimates that came from the Budget for all five.

Mr. BRITTEN. The gentleman said \$400,000 awhile ago.

Mr. FRENCH. That would include \$200,000 carried over from this year's money, a total of \$400,000.

Mr. BRITTEN. For the second bloc?

Mr. FRENCH. For the second bloc. When the treaty indicated that three of the cruisers would be postponed until 1933, 1934, or 1935, it was the thought of the committee that since the amount of \$400,000 would be adequate only to begin construction, whether of two or of five, we let the amount remain in the bill and apply it upon the commencement of two.

Mr. BRITTEN. So that the entire \$400,000 then will go toward the commencement of two of the seven?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. Then the gentleman suggested that section 21, the escalator section, might not give us a free hand if we built up more or less to our limits under the treaty. The gentleman did not mean that, did he?

Mr. FRENCH. Oh, yes; I meant exactly that. Under that provision of the treaty it would be all right to build up in the ships that would be constructed by the other nations.

Mr. BRITTEN. But in addition to everything else carried in the treaty?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes, in addition to everything else; but if we had been so unwise as to build up to the topmost figure of every category, it might be that we could not approach the question of building still further just to keep up with the Joneses, because we had already exhausted so much money in building up in other types where we have the privilege of building, but which would not be modified by the escalator provision at all.

Does the gentleman realize that when we built the destroyers, for instance, following and during the World War, we did not do that to please ourselves, but did it because we were part of the forces that were at war upon one side of a question against the Central Powers? Other nations were equipped in such a way that they said, "You are the nation that ought now to build destroyers." We built them and we built them in twice the tonnage that we needed, and I want to avoid any such necessity as that if we should find ourselves—which I think we shall not—confronted with the question the gentleman raises.

Mr. BRITTEN. The escalator section, 21, provides very distinctly that any building made necessary by that section will be in excess of building provided for generally in the treaty.

Mr. FRENCH. That is true.

Mr. BRITTEN. It also provides that if England should determine she needs 30,000 to 40,000 tons of subchasers to chase French submarines, in that event we are permitted to build up to 30,000 or 40,000 tons of ships, but they must be subchasers.

Mr. FRENCH. That is right.

Mr. BRITTEN. How does the gentleman figure our hands are tied in building through the general categories, when everything connected with this section 21 will be in excess of all other building anyway?

Mr. FRENCH. If the gentleman wants to assume that because we may have invested a billion dollars or more in new ships all at once, that we then are willing to invest still more hundreds of millions in other craft we do not need under the "escape section," of course, it would be possible for us to do it under the treaty; but what I say is that we would have a freer hand, from an economic standpoint, from the standpoint of the Treasury, if we do not find ourselves built up to the limit of all the categories.

Mr. BRITTEN. I get the point. The gentleman's point, as I see it, is this: That if we were not built up in the various categories, instead of taking advantage of this excess building authorized, we could go and build up in the categories where we already had a deficiency.

Mr. FRENCH. With the same amount of money we could do just that. We either could do that or we could build any type that would be built by the nation taking advantage of the escape clause. It is a question of finances.

Mr. BRITTEN. I understand that. The gentleman will agree with me that the London conference was brought about with a view to provide parity at least between Great Britain and the United States on the sea.

Mr. FRENCH. Two questions, of course, were dominant in the minds of the people representing our Government. One was the question of parity, to which the gentleman from Illinois refers. The other one was the fixing of limitations, the question of stabilizing the tonnage in such a way as to remove rivalry; and still another, which is part of the second, reduction of tonnage.

I make that statement having in mind the cardinal statement made by the President of the United States in his Armistice Day speech of last November, that reduction of tonnage could not be too low for us.

Mr. BRITTEN. That statement is satisfactory to me. We have been working together here happily for a number of years. On the question of reduction, I am sorry the conference did not go deeper into the cruisers and other types. Now we are confronted with the question of a proper national defense, and the question of whether or not we are actually going to have parity with England. The gentleman's remarks were generally framed in a spirit of conservation and economy. I have that same spirit, too. But, on the other hand, I also have a spirit that desires equality on the high seas with any other nation. In other words, I do not believe the United States, with its financial power, its social power, and its political power, should be satisfied with a second-class navy.

Mr. FRENCH. Would the gentleman's position be modified if he saw Great Britain was following a moderate policy? Would the gentleman's position be modified if he would recognize that?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes; we should modify it.

Mr. FRENCH. Then, does not the gentleman think Great Britain will react in like measure toward the United States, and does he not think that what is done in the Congress will be reflected in the British Parliament? If we follow moderation in building programs under the London treaty, I am satisfied Great Britain and Japan will do the same thing.

Mr. BRITTEN. I must recall what transpired at the Washington conference as a matter of history. The gentleman from Idaho himself was there, and I know I was down in the Daughters of the American Revolution Building when Balfour, representing King George, came over here and slapped himself on the chest and in that characteristic manner of his, and turning to Secretary Hughes, said, "The spirit of this 5-5 agreement, applying only to ships of the first line, will be carried down to the various categories."

Then he went back to England and what happened? They immediately started the construction of the greatest cruiser program the world had ever seen.

In connection with this London conference I may say also that it is not a question of spirit but a question of agreement. We can not lead Great Britain into disarmament, and we can not lead Japan into disarmament by ourselves taking the lead. That is a false policy. We must have a Navy second to none on earth, a Navy commensurate with our position in world affairs, if we would induce naval limitation. So long as we are inferior there will be no honest attempts at disarmament.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. I am greatly indebted to the gentleman from Idaho for his full discussion and the opening up in such a wonderful way of this entire subject. The gentleman referred to the work load in the yards. Could the gentleman say whether his committee has at this time considered the advisability of appropriating money this year for modernizing the three remaining battleships so that they can take the place of those that are in the yards now, when they are completed next February?

Mr. FRENCH. I do not understand there is authorization for such a program. It is not a matter that has been before our committee at all.

Mr. BRIGGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. I yield.

Mr. BRIGGS. Will the gentleman state succinctly to what extent the London naval treaty is reflected in the present appropriation bill, in dollars and cents; by what amount which otherwise would be carried in this bill, but for the London naval treaty?

Mr. FRENCH. I think the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Briggs] must have been out of the Chamber at the moment I spoke upon that subject. I said that as to new work, we are just on the threshold of the program on the second block of five cruisers and the third block of five cruisers. Therefore, a small amount of money was included in the 1931 bill for both blocks as the bill came from the Budget.

The \$400,000 included for the third block of five cruisers was eliminated from the bill by the committee. The share that would have gone to three of the five cruisers of the second block was diverted to two other cruisers of that block, since we will not need to appropriate for the three until some four years from now. With regard to other money that will be affected, if the treaty shall be ratified, that money can be subtracted by the administration when the administration will be in possession of such facts such as date when ratification may be made. We do not know to-day whether or not the treaty will be ratified. If ratified, then battleships may come out, and moneys may be saved in personnel, in fuel oil, in engineering, in construction and repair, and in a variety of ways. It is the same with regard to submarines and other craft.

Mr. BRIGGS. That is the information I wanted to elicit from the gentleman.

Mr. ARENTZ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. ARENTZ. I think the gentleman has stated what various newspapers throughout the United States have stated as well, that one effect of the London treaty is that there has been a specific tonnage stated as to the several categories in the program; but there is a difference, and a most decided one, between the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Idaho. The gentleman from Idaho believes that to build up to the limit would result in this, that in 1936—when we will have another conference in London—there will be nothing to offer in the way of saying, "Here, we do not want to scrap ships but we do want the limitation of armaments cut down to what it is now." The gentleman from Illinois believes we should build up to the limit so that in 1936, following out the policy of President Hoover, we can have a curtailment of construction but we will scrap ships in doing so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has again expired.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire to use. First, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Idaho, the chairman of the subcommittee, on the excellent statement he has made in explaining this bill. He always makes a good statement, but I believe this is the best one I have ever heard him make. [Applause.] In addition to that, I want to congratulate him on his defense of the treaty that came out of the London conference, which we hope and assume will be ratified by the Senate.

The people of this Nation should feel grateful to President Hoover and the delegates who represented our country in the London Naval Conference for what they have managed to accomplish. Our plenipotentiaries were Ambassador Charles G. Dawes, Secretary of the Navy Charles Francis Adams, Senator Joseph T. Robinson, Senator David A. Reed, Ambassador Hugh Gibson, and Ambassador Dwight W. Morrow. To each of these distinguished gentlemen, in my judgment, the Nation owes a debt of gratitude. [Applause.]

While the treaty may not be all that we had hoped for, it is the basis for a wonderful start in the right direction, particularly if it shall not be construed to impose an obligation to

build up to the limits fixed in the several categories, irrespective of our actual needs or what other nations may do.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. It seems to me the language of the treaty itself reinforces the argument made by the gentleman from Idaho and the argument the gentleman is making, that it is not to be implied that we are under any mandate or obligation to build up to the maximum of tonnage in any category that may be allowed by the treaty.

Mr. AYRES. That is correct.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I find in the treaty that it is twice stated that the right of replacement is not lost by delay. It is evidently contemplated by those who negotiated the treaty that any particular nation might fall far short of building up to the maximum.

Mr. AYRES. The gentleman is correct.

Moreover, it lays a foundation for greater achievements at the next conference. I might say millions of people of this Nation were hoping that the spirit expressed in President Hoover's Armistice Day address on the 11th of last November would prevail at the London conference, and that there would be an agreement reached by the Nations for an actual and immediate reduction of naval armament.

While it is true that under the provisions of the London treaty there will be but little reduction in the allowable gross tonnage in naval armaments, there will be the next best thing, and that is a definite limitation in naval construction in all categories, which, after all, is an achievement not accomplished by any other conference in the past. If the provisions of this treaty are carried out in response to the dictates of our national needs, it should mean, instead of naval appropriations increasing each year by leaps and bounds, that there will be a halt in the upward trend and ultimately possibly some reduction. I think I voice the sentiment of this committee when I say that the committee as a whole believes in adequate preparedness for this Nation at all times and in every particular, but we have looked forward to the time when some action would be taken by the nations, burdened with large and expensive naval establishments, to stop competitive naval building programs.

I trust none of you will become unduly alarmed over what we hear of a billion-dollar building program, mostly replacement. In the first place, had there been no London conference, it would have been necessary for us in time not only to build replacements of all existing tonnage but to add new tonnage according to the programs of other governments. In replacement tonnage the treaty does save us the enormous expense that ultimately would confront us of replacing some 76,000 tons of destroyers and approximately 35,000 tons of submarines. As to additional 6-inch gun cruiser tonnage, all but 23,000 tons is offset by the five of the fifteen 10,000-ton cruisers which we are not to build under the terms of the treaty. Now as to the need to replace our existing destroyer tonnage, let me tell you that only recently we replaced 58 destroyers in commission with an equal number which had been in reserve.

As to these destroyers the Chief of the Bureau of Construction and Repair has told us that their expected life would be something like 10 or 12 years. So that to say that the treaty will be responsible for a billion dollar building program does not conform with the facts. The treaty actually permits a saving in replacement construction and occasions no additional expense beyond 23,000 tons of 6-inch gun cruisers and possibly some other light cruiser and large destroyer tonnage under certain optional provisions of the treaty, as to the cost of which it would be rather previous even to hazard a guess.

If nothing had been accomplished at the London conference, we would have expected the Budget for the Naval Establishment in the near future to have imposed demands annually ranging from \$500,000,000 to \$600,000,000; and when the replacement program is taken into consideration touching all types, I hesitate to say just what the annual draft might have been.

Mr. Chairman, this is not all by any means, but it should be sufficient to show where we are drifting; and if the conference succeeded in making a treaty that will limit future naval construction among the nations its work should be applauded as a great and wonderful achievement.

We did not feel that it would be appropriate to anticipate ratification of the treaty and make reductions on such an assumption. However, the naval appropriation measure now under consideration reflects a saving or reduction of \$400,000, traceable, perhaps, to the treaty, but in reality as being unnecessary at this time irrespective of the treaty. The amount relates to the construction of the third increment of five 10,000-ton cruisers, which we do not feel should be commenced during the coming fiscal year should the treaty not be ratified, because

of our desire to avoid an uneven work load in Government and private yards.

The removal of three capital ships from the active list, as provided by the treaty, should reflect an annual saving of at least \$4,000,000. I only wish it had been possible for the delegates to have reached an agreement to have retired all 18 of the capital ships. The postponement of their replacement, however, is a good omen and I confidently look to their complete elimination when another conference shall convene. With the advent of the airplane and the development of the submarine, a ship less vulnerable and possessing more speed and greater maneuverability, will be the capital ship of the future in my judgment.

Postponement of capital-ship replacement does, however, relieve us from the burden of carrying out the Washington treaty which provides that, beginning with the year 1931, the United States would be required or permitted to lay down 10 capital ships prior to 1937 at a total estimated expenditure up to 1937 of \$281,250,000.

I am in hopes that by the time we get ready for the next conference all of the countries will be won over to the idea of a further limitation of armament. I am confident the results of the London conference will contribute to the realization of this wish.

I repeat, the people of the United States should be profoundly grateful to President Hoover and the delegates who represented our country at the conference just adjourned. [Applause.]

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. For a question.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. I wanted to ask the gentleman if he really believed the battleship is to continue to be an important factor in the naval program of the nations of the earth, in view of the development of the submarine and the airplane?

Mr. AYRES. I will say to the gentleman from Louisiana that I do not, and I have so expressed myself in the remarks I just made. If I did not, I intended to do so.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. I yield.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I would like to ask the gentleman, so as to clarify the atmosphere somewhat for those who have not given as much attention to this subject as members of the committee have, what this matter of parity means?

Is the parity contained in the treaty a mere privilege or do we derive from it an implication that it is to be the test of the national defense to which we intend to come up to and build up to?

Mr. AYRES. I think this Nation should build up to where it is necessary for its own needs in the way of a navy regardless of whether it may be on a parity with Great Britain, France, or any other country.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Then the gentleman thinks the matter of parity is really immaterial?

Mr. AYRES. I would not go that far.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. It raises no serious obligation and no serious implication on the part of this country to come up to the standard of parity set up in the treaty?

Mr. AYRES. My position is that there is no serious obligation on the part of this country to be on a parity with other nations. I am only expressing my own individual opinion.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I was asking the gentleman his conception of the term "parity" as used in the treaty and not so much for his own personal view.

Mr. AYRES. I do not find that the term "parity" is used anywhere in the treaty.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. It is used very much in the discussion of the treaty.

Mr. AYRES. That may be, but the gentleman asked my conception of the provision in the treaty with reference to the matter of parity.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SABATH. For weeks I have read in various newspapers reports of the activities of the London conference and in each and every instance I read of the wonderful saving that this conference would bring about to the Nation. I am informed this bill carries the tremendous appropriation of \$377,000,000.

Mr. AYRES. Yes.

Mr. SABATH. About \$14,000,000 more than we appropriated last year. Can the gentleman explain where the saving is coming in or how the administration has saved these tremendous sums that are given out by the press from time to time as having been saved for the taxpayers of the Nation?

Mr. AYRES. I may answer the question by asking the gentleman one. Would the gentleman expect a treaty that has not

been ratified, a treaty that has been agreed upon within the last week or so, to be reflected in an appropriation bill that was reported out within the last few days? What we are contemplating is that it will be reflected in the appropriation bills of the future, and undoubtedly it will be. The gentleman from Idaho explained to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRIGGS] that the only real saving, if it may be called a saving, in the present bill is \$400,000, and the gentleman explained the reason for that, as did I in the early part of my remarks. We could not expect, I will say to the gentleman from Illinois, that a saving would be reflected in this bill at this particular time by reason of the treaty.

Mr. SABATH. Answering the gentleman, I may say I was led to believe that the reporting of this bill was being delayed for the purpose of ascertaining whether the London treaty would be of such a nature as to provide a certain saving in the future and at the same time to see whether or not the enormous appropriation that had been asked could be reduced. Therefore I was under the impression when the bill was reported a few days ago that the committee had taken into consideration this fact and was hopeful that in reporting the bill it would not be necessary to increase the appropriation by \$14,000,000 more than was appropriated last year.

Mr. AYRES. I will say to the gentleman that the committee did not have the idea in holding back the reporting out of this measure that the London conference would necessarily reflect immediate savings. There were other considerations, I might say, that influenced the course of the committee.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana two minutes.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I rise largely for the purpose of getting information through the elaboration of a statement that has been expressed here to-day.

Of course, the common thought on this subject throughout the country is that the London conference was called for the purpose of reducing naval expenditures. I do not know that any different interpretation of the conference has been arrived at by those in a position to make such an interpretation. Evidently there is a good deal of conflict of opinion upon it. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN], who has given the matter a great deal of thought and study, is evidently under the impression it will make for a program upon our part that will approximate \$1,000,000,000 within six years. This is at variance with the thought there would be a reduction as a result of this conference.

However, the thought that is in my mind is that for years there have been two schools of thought with reference to the necessity of the battleship in a naval program. I believe the thought that it is no longer in the picture, or that it no longer would serve a country in any great naval conflict, has been daily expressed by the Hearst newspapers. I mention this not doubtingly, because in all probability these writers have investigated the subject and have given it considerable thought, and while they express their views rather strongly still this school of thought, I suppose, has its chief proponents in the Hearst newspapers. In view of their large circulation and the vigorous manner of their advancing a proposition and the intellectuality of the editorial staff, these newspapers are a force in American affairs that have to be considered and reckoned with.

I am wondering whether the gentlemen present here who have had to do with appropriations and with authorizations are in a position to express a viewpoint as to whether or not the battleship is slowly but inevitably fading away from the picture and that in the future cruisers, submarines, and airplanes will form the most formidable and the most important part of our naval program.

If the submarines, for instance, are to form an important part in the naval program, it has occurred to me that recently I had the honor of attending a meeting of the Committee on Naval Affairs, of which I was formerly a member, and at this meeting the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN], absolutely demonstrated to the satisfaction of every one present that if there be an art or craftsmanship in submarine construction that art is absolutely lacking in this country.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. The gentleman is not quite correct in his statement. We are building submarines now. We are building some very good submarines, and the remark that the gentleman has in mind is evidently based on a question that the chairman of the committee asked a rear admiral who was before the committee, as to whether or not we were building as good sub-

marines as were built in any country of the world, and the admiral replied that he did not think we were.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. That is practically stating what I said a few minutes ago, that if it is an art or craft we are not as well up in the art or workmanship as other nations. I believe that was substantially the answer to the gentleman from Illinois.

But the thought uppermost in my mind is that the program apparently does not contemplate any new construction from the battleship standpoint.

Mr. BRITTEN. No; it does not, prior to 1936.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. I was under the impression that the sea conflict at Jutland had demonstrated that the battleship is no longer a formidable part of naval armament of any country, and that the great battleships that are prisons for the men who are upon them and operate them are inevitably going out of the picture and will give place to the submarines and to probably the most formidable of all instrumentalities of war—the airplanes.

Mr. BRITTEN. The Battle of Jutland was fought by some 45 first-line ships. Not one of those ships was struck by a torpedo from a submarine, and no aircraft of any kind took part in that engagement. Germany, France, and England had literally hundreds of airplanes, bombers, and pursuit planes, and they had submarines. But no airplanes or Zeppelins took part in the battle, and no torpedo was fired from a submarine that touched a single battleship.

The best naval experts of Germany, England, France, Japan, and the United States state that up to date the backbone of the Navy is the battleship.

The gentleman refers to the Hearst papers; and, probably Mr. Brisbane, who says that a hundred airplanes flying over a battleship could destroy it; but the first question to be asked is: How are the airplanes going to reach the battleship on the other side of the ocean? They have to come across on an airplane carrier, and airplane carriers have to be protected; and the best expert advice that we have is that the battleship is still the backbone of the Navy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. AYRES. I yield the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. I rose for the purpose, largely as the result of a very amiable but spirited conversation with my good friend from Hawaii, Delegate Houstox, this morning in respect to the value of battleships. He is a strong proponent of their value, as is the gentleman from Illinois. I was under the impression that at the Battle of Jutland the battleships had to be surrounded and protected. The battle did not decide anything at all, and during the time they were getting ready they had to be surrounded and protected.

Mr. BRITTEN. The gentleman suggests that the Battle of Jutland did not decide anything; it decided once and for all that Great Britain held the supremacy of the seas.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. But Germany did not contest that.

Mr. BRITTEN. When the German Navy came out to challenge the British fleet it was demonstrated that Great Britain ruled the seas.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. I do not think the supremacy of the seas was questioned before, and therefore the battle did not decide it. Like the Battle of Blenheim, from old Kaspar's viewpoint, "It was a famous victory," except that as a result of the controversy that has raged all around it since the Battle of Jutland was fought, many experts evidently do not know whom to give the victory which was barren of any real accomplishment. However, I wish to thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN] for embellishing my few remarks with the information that he has placed within them, and the generous manner in which he yielded to my request for that knowledge concerning our Navy and its needs, with which matters he is thoroughly informed as a result of long and thoughtful consideration.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. ESICK].

Mr. ESICK. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the committee, for a short time I shall speak in behalf of House bill No. 8979, now pending before the Military Affairs Committee. It is a bill authorizing the appropriation of \$150,000 for the improvement of the Meriwether Lewis National Monument, for the restoration of the tavern, once located therein, for use as a museum, and for other purposes. The Meriwether Lewis National Monument, or Park, is located in Lewis County, Tenn., about 70 miles southwest of Nashville, and where Captain Lewis is buried.

I know the story of the Lewis and Clark expedition is more or less familiar to you, yet I want to recall something of Captain Lewis's life, with its melancholy ending. I want to rehearse some of his many achievements, and what it meant to our country. Upon his record, I shall ask that his final resting place be cared for by the Government he served so well.

Capt. Meriwether Lewis was born near Charlottesville, Va., August 18, 1774, and he died at Grinder's Tavern on the old Natchez Trace, on the night of October 11, 1809, in what was then Hickman County, Tenn., but is now Lewis County—a county named in honor of the great explorer.

He was only 35 years of age when he died. His was an active life and one full of achievement. He was a captain in the Regular Army, Secretary to President Jefferson, commander of the expedition to Oregon in 1803-1806, and Governor of the Louisiana Territory at the time of his death.

He was of good ancestry. His mother's people, the Meriwethers, were of the highest standing and among the first families of Virginia. One of Lewis's uncles married Betty, the only sister of George Washington. He was Private Secretary to President Jefferson and relinquished this high position to head the Oregon expedition.

While only a part of his work, the name and fame of Captain Lewis rests largely on the Lewis and Clark expedition to the Northwest. Captain Lewis left Washington City on July 5, 1803. He first went to Pittsburgh and Philadelphia. Finally he went overland from Louisville to St. Louis, arriving in December, while Capt. William Clark went down the Ohio River with the boats and the men who were to make up the expedition.

When Toussaint l'Ouverture, born a slave in Africa, with his wild and disordered followers wiped out the trained troops of Napoleon in Santo Domingo it changed the Emperor's plans with respect to his holdings in the Western Hemisphere. Troubles were plentiful at his own door. Before him stood Leipzig, Austerlitz, Wagram, and finally defeat and disaster at Waterloo. It was necessary that Napoleon dispose of his American possessions. There were two imperative reasons. It was too far from home and he needed the money for it.

President Jefferson bought this Territory from Napoleon for \$15,000,000. The purchase was confirmed by Congress October 17, 1803, some months after the contract of sale and purchase was entered into by the French Emperor and the American President. The French colors went down and the Stars and Stripes were raised over the newly acquired land on December 20, 1803.

If you will look at the map showing the 48 States of the Union, you will see that it is divided into three parts, each practically of the same size; that body of country lying to the east of the Mississippi River—with the Louisiana Purchase as the central part of the United States; and then the States to the west of the Louisiana Purchase, forming the western part, or third. The Louisiana Purchase touched neither ocean, and for only a short distance it bordered the Gulf of Mexico. It extended from the mouth of the Mississippi in the Gulf of Mexico to British Columbia. This was the greatest land sale in human history. Eight hundred and eighty-three thousand and seventy-two square miles, or 565,166,080 acres were conveyed to us. Its boundaries were loosely defined. Neither Napoleon nor Jefferson knew the correct boundaries, nor the approximate description of this land. In fact, no one could state them correctly or with exactness.

Almost two months after Jefferson contracted for the Louisiana territory, he planned the expedition, and asked his secretary, Captain Lewis, to take charge of it. On June 20, 1803, President Jefferson gave written directions to Lewis. It is a lengthy paper with many and comprehensive instructions. Briefly, its purpose was to ascertain what we got under the Louisiana Purchase; to learn something of the territory lying to the west of it, with the Pacific Ocean as an outlet. He was directed to learn of the peoples inhabiting the territory from the Mississippi to the Pacific coast, their habits, occupation, the climatic conditions, and the kinds of soil. Whether the land abounded with minerals, and so forth. Special attention was given to the water courses, beginning at the mouth of the Missouri River and ending on the western coast.

The real expedition started from the mouth of the Wood (Du Bois) River, opposite the mouth of the Missouri River in the State of Illinois on May 14, 1804, and it reached St. Louis on its return September 23, 1806, consuming in this part of the expedition, 2 years 4 months and 9 days. The trip was made in crude craft by water and on foot from the mouth of the Missouri River to the mouth of the Columbia River, a distance of 4,135 miles, or a total of 8,270 miles, through a vast wilderness among uncivilized people. The soldier of fortune was the only representative of the white race who had preceded Lewis

and his party. The expedition was through a land inhabited by savage Indian tribes. The forests were full of wild animals. This journey covered more than 8,200 miles, every foot of which was through an unfriendly and hostile country, beyond the reach of aid from friendly hands; a history-making journey, full of the greatest of human hardships. The full party consisted of 45 men. Of this number, in the spring of 1805, 16 men left the main party at the Mandan towns and returned. But one death occurred in the party. Sargent Floyd died August 20, 1804, and is buried in Sioux City, Iowa, out on the beautiful river bank known as Floyd's Bluff. A \$20,000 monument marks the traveler's final home. The United States contributed \$5,000 to this monument.

A journey from St. Louis to the Pacific is a short trip now. This is the day of the steam car, the electrical age, the automobile, and the airplane. But when Lewis and Clark made their path-finding expedition it was even before the day of the horse and wagon. Farther back than that—there was no covered wagon, with its oxen, and if these had existed there were no roads for travel—not even a trace through the forest wilds. It was, indeed, a charge into no-man's land—looking out upon the star of hope, with an abiding faith in Him who guides the destiny of men, that these brave souls wrote a chapter of pioneer history in achievements that will continue to grow in importance as the years go by. In fact, men and events are not measured in their day—but by the historian and the generations of another age.

Capt. Meriwether Lewis, in the great Northwest, was the pathfinder and the first evangel of the white man's civilization. What did this expedition cost the Government?

It will amaze you how little the Lewis and Clark expedition cost the Government. Lewis made his own estimate. Let me read it to you:

| | |
|---|-------|
| Mathematical instruments | \$217 |
| Arms and accoutrements extraordinary | 81 |
| Camp equipage | 255 |
| Medicine and packing | 55 |
| Means of transportation | 430 |
| Indian presents | 696 |
| Provisions extraordinary | 224 |
| Materials for making up the various articles into portable packs | 55 |
| For the pay of hunters, guides, and interpreters | 300 |
| In silver coin, to defray the expenses of the party from Nashville to the last settlement on the Missouri | 100 |
| Contingencies | 87 |
| Total | 2,500 |

A total of \$2,500. Why in 1899-1900, for the use of the United States Geological Survey, upon which the old Powell-Wheeler and Haden surveys were merged, Congress appropriated \$834,240.

What of the West and Northwest then? And now? Then, the Mississippi was the western limit of civilization. St. Louis had only 925 people, and there was not a State west of the Mississippi River. In that vast body of land from the Mississippi to the Pacific coast there was not a single Senator or Representative in Congress, while east of the river were 34 Senators and more than 80 Congressmen. It was a vast body of land. The Louisiana Purchase was larger than continental Europe. It had no city or town of size except St. Louis. The hand of civilization had barely touched the primeval forest. From this great wilderness has been carved the States of Arkansas, Missouri, Iowa, Nebraska, North and South Dakota, nearly all of Louisiana, Oklahoma, Kansas, Wyoming, Montana, about two-thirds of Minnesota, one-third of Colorado, and a part of Texas.

The Oregon territory was a key situation to the United States. The claim of the United States to this territory was based on the discovery of the Columbia River in 1792 by Capt. Robert Gray, the Lewis and Clark expedition of 1805-6, the Astorian settlement of 1811, and finally in 1819 the title of Spain was acquired. It is said that the real foundation of our right to the Oregon territory was based on the discoveries and the travels of Lewis and Clark in the expedition of 1805-6. The great West and Northwest were covered by the Lewis and Clark expedition. The territory between the Louisiana Purchase and the Pacific and the Gulf was directly affected by this incursion. Our domain west of the Mississippi is within itself a great empire, with its limitless wealth and resources; with its billions of capital invested in agriculture and lands and industrial enterprises; with its millions of population, its many happy homes. That territory now has a representation in the Senate equal to, and in the House far larger than, the rest of the Union when Captain Lewis lived. Before the Lewis and Clark expedition the great area west of the Mississippi River produced no revenue for the Government. It was a liability in taxation and open to invasion. To-day it is an important part of the great Union, with immense wealth and population. In taxes it is pouring millions of dollars into the Federal Treasury, and from its livestock and agricultural productions it could

feed the teeming millions of the world. By the Oregon boundary settlement we got 183,386,240 acres of land rich in fertility of soil, timber, and mineral resources.

Ex-President Coolidge is soon to write a 500-word history, to be carved on Mount Rushmore, S. Dak., in letters so large it can be read 3 miles away. This history will cover eight epochs in our history. Four of these, either directly or indirectly, bear the guiding hand or impress of Meriwether Lewis and his expedition. They are the Louisiana Purchase of 1803, annexation of Texas in 1846, the Oregon boundary settlement in 1848, and the admission of California in 1849, and for 120 years, Meriwether Lewis, America's greatest explorer, the first of our hardy pioneers, who made the official survey of our public domain in the Northwest, "America's unsung hero," has slept in a lonely grave in the old Natchez Trace in the woodlands of Lewis County, Tenn., spending there the long, long night in death while the Government he had served so well forgot him. The students of American history make their pilgrimages there, and in the quiet woodland they find the grave, over it a little broken shaft of limestone erected by the State of Tennessee in 1848 at a cost of \$500.

THE MERIWETHER LEWIS MEMORIAL ASSOCIATION

The Meriwether Lewis Memorial Association is a voluntary organization. It is not incorporated and is without endowment. This body took up the work of caring for the tomb of Meriwether Lewis with such donations as were made by individuals. A big-hearted, generous citizen of Maury County, Mr. Clint Moore, owned the land around the grave; he donated it. The State bought 250 acres of adjacent land, and this 300-acre tract was deeded to the United States. The deed was accepted by President Coolidge and he declared the park the Meriwether Lewis National Monument. For the last three or four years it has been under the charge of the War Department. The superintendent of the Shiloh National Park has charge and supervision of it.

Until 1925 the Federal Government did not notice the Lewis burial place—never spent a dollar in marking or beautifying the grave of the patriot who had aided so much in extending the western boundaries of the United States from the Mississippi River to the Pacific coast.

John Trotwood Moore, the historian and novelist, Tennessee's sweet singer, was the first president of this association. When he died P. E. Cox, State archaeologist, succeeded him. The board of directors are among the highest and best of our splendid citizenship. It is composed of P. E. Cox, Samuel H. Hinton, Hugh Lee Webster, Frank A. Goodman, T. J. Petway, Charles Grossman, William W. Pollock, Dr. J. J. Reavis, and Gen. Claude Boyd. None of these men have received a penny compensation. They have contributed their own funds. It has been a labor of love in paying tribute to the memory of this great pioneer American.

SUICIDE OR MURDER?

May I not say a few words about the tragic death of Captain Lewis? It may interest you. It will probably never be known as a certainty whether he died by his own hand or was murdered. He was Governor of the Louisiana Territory at the time of his death. He was on his way from St. Louis to Washington to report to the President. He carried 4 trunks, 2 with public documents and 2 with personal and private papers and property. He had two servants, one a Spaniard and the other a negro. A Mr. Neely, the United States Indian agent at Memphis, was with him until the day before his death, when he stopped on the way looking for some lost horses, and was not with Captain Lewis when he died.

Lewis was following the old Natchez Trace. He came to Grinder's Inn, or tavern, about sundown. He asked to spend the night. This tavern was the first house on entering the white man's land and the last going from Nashville into the Indian territory. Lewis stopped to spend the night of October 11, 1809. The servants went to the barn, about 200 yards away, to sleep. Joshua Grinder apparently was not in when Lewis arrived. Only Mrs. Grinder and Polly Spencer, the white cook, were there. Captain Lewis either suicided or was murdered that night. Most historians have accepted the suicide theory. This is largely based on the letter of President Jefferson to Paul Allen, of Philadelphia, doubtless based on rumors and secondhand information, and especially on the unbelievable story of Mrs. Grinder, told to the ornithologist, Alexander Wilson. Mrs. Grinder told Wilson that Captain Lewis shot himself twice; that she heard him in his struggles calling for help and to heal his wounds; that she could see that a part of his skull was blown away. She said that he begged that they would shoot and kill him.

As against the suicide story and sustaining the murder view there is abundant evidence. Governor Lewis was known to have a large amount of money with him, and only 25 cents was found

after his death. His private trunks were taken, in which he kept his will and many family heirlooms, jewelry and trinkets, and these were not recovered by his family for many years—as I remember, it was 35 years after his death.

James D. Parks, of Franklin, Tenn., a student of Lewis's career, was deeply interested in knowing the real facts of his death. He made first-hand investigation and inquiry. He probably came nearer getting the correct information and real facts of what happened on the night of Captain Lewis's death than any other person. He gives splendid authority for his opinion and belief that Lewis was murdered. In 1891 he had an interview with Mrs. Christiana B. Anthony, who lived a short distance from where Lewis died, and she knew Polly Spencer, an intelligent young white woman, who was the expert cook at the Grinder Tavern and was in the tavern when Lewis was shot.

I ask unanimous consent to read into the RECORD Mr. Parks's statement, which I believe to be the authentic story of Lewis's death. It is reliable and conclusive that Lewis was murdered and did not die by his own hand. I read from pages 69, 71, and 72, volume 1, Olin D. Wheeler's *The Trail of Lewis and Clark*:

It has always been the firm belief of the people of this region that Governor Lewis was murdered and robbed. The oldest citizens now living remember the rumors current at the time as to the murder, and it seems that no thought of suicide ever obtained footing here. The writer recently had an interview with Mrs. Christina B. Anthony, who lives some 2 miles from the Lewis grave and has lived all her life of 77 years in the neighborhood. She says that old man Grinder kept a "stand" for travelers on the Natchez Trace. Polly Spencer, whom she knew well before her death about 40 years ago, was a hired girl at Grinder's when Governor Lewis was killed. Polly had often told the circumstances of the murder so far as she personally knew them.

She was washing dishes in the kitchen after supper with some of the females of the family when they heard a shot in the room where Captain Lewis was sleeping. All rushed into the room and found him dead in his bed. Captain Lewis, being fatigued from his journey, had retired immediately after supper. His only companion, she said, was a negro boy, who was attending to the horses in the barn at the time. Old Grinder, who was of Indian blood, was at once suspected of the murder, ran away, was captured at Cane Creek, brought back and tried, but the proof not being positive, he was released. Only 25 cents was found on the person of Captain Lewis after he was shot.

Old Grinder soon afterwards removed to the western part of the State, and it was reported in his old neighborhood had bought a number of slaves and a farm and seemed to have plenty of money. Before this he had always been quite poor.

Mrs. Anthony says the people always believed that old Grinder killed Mr. Lewis and got his money. She had never heard of the theory of suicide until the writer mentioned it to her. Mrs. Anthony was a young married woman, boarding with the father of Polly Spencer when Polly told her these circumstances. Mrs. Anthony thus heard an ear witness, so to speak, relate the story of the murder, which is pretty direct evidence. She is a bright, active, and intelligent old lady, and has for many years kept the little hotel at the hamlet of Newberg, the county seat of Lewis County, which is just 2 miles east of the monument.

Others living in Lewis and adjoining counties have been conversed with, who remember the general belief at that time, that Grinder killed his guest for the purpose of robbery. He must have observed that Captain Lewis was a person of distinction and wealth; that he was almost alone, and that he probably had money with him. It seems incredible that a young man of 35, the governor of the vast Territory of Louisiana, then on the way from his capital to that of the Nation, where he knew he would be received with all the distinction and consideration due his office and reputation, should take his own life. His whole character is a denial of this theory. He was too brave and conscientious in the discharge of every duty, public and private; too conspicuous a person in the eyes of the country, and crowned with too many laurels to cowardly sneak out of the world by the back way, a self-murderer. This idea was doubtless invented to cover up the double crime of robbery and murder, and seems to have been the only version of his death that reached Mr. Jefferson and other friends in Virginia.

Maj. William J. Webster, dean of the Columbia, Tenn., bar, quite an aged man, was born and reared within a mile and a half of where Lewis died. He has devoted much work and thought to Lewis's history. He knew a number of people who lived in that section when Captain Lewis died, and he often heard them discuss the tragedy. He told me that it was universally believed in that community that Captain Lewis was brutally murdered for the purpose of robbery. The theory of suicide was not heard there for many years. That Captain Lewis was murdered and robbed was an accepted fact.

The State of Tennessee appropriated \$500 for a monument to Lewis. This monument, aged and broken, stands above the grave on the edge of the old Natchez Trace. The Lewis monu-

ment committee of the Tennessee Legislature, in its report to the general assembly in 1849-50, says:

The impression has long prevailed that under the influence of disease of body and mind—of hopes based upon long and valuable services—not merely deferred, but wholly disappointed—Governor Lewis perished by his own hands. It seems to be more probable that he died by the hands of an assassin.

THE NATCHEZ TRACE

The Natchez Trace, in which Captain Lewis is buried, is within itself historical. It stretched through the primeval forest like a ribbon of moonlight. It was the first road in America built wholly or in part by Federal labor and money. By treaty with the Indians, while in command at Fort Adam, General Wilkinson established a road through their territory. Post riders carried the mail on the Natchez Trace, and were killed by the Indians as far back as 1790. The opening of this road was done under the immediate direction of Capt. Robert E. Butler and Lieut. E. P. Gaines. They had Indian guides and 10 companies of men in the laying out and the opening of this Indian trace as a post road.

For many years neither Tennessee nor Mississippi, nor the counties of either State, contributed labor or money for the maintenance of this road. It was maintained purely as a Federal road.

THE LEWIS PARK

Just a few words about the Lewis Park. It is about 12 miles from the Andrew Jackson Highway, the great arterial highway leading from the Lakes to the Gulf. The Lewis and Clark Highway runs west from the Andrew Jackson Highway by the Lewis Park and cross the State of Tennessee to the Missouri State line. Other States are being asked to name the intersecting highways leading to the Pacific coast the Lewis and Clark Highway.

The old tavern is long since gone. The only building there is a small office erected since the War Department took charge. A little work has been done on the roads within the park and in beautifying the grounds where the broken shaft stands above the grave of Captain Lewis.

Congress has many, many times honored our immortal and heroic dead. Only a short while ago, Congress gave a million dollars to honor the memory of George Rogers Clark, a brother of Capt. William Clark, second in command of the Lewis and Clark expedition. This was right. I make no complaint. I believe in honoring the memory of the dead who honored and served their country while living. Ours is a land of memories, because it has its heroes, and these heroes have written lasting pages of world history. Meriwether Lewis was one of them. Among the foremost in our history, in fact in all the ages. I shall not believe that Congress will withhold from his memory this modest tribute—a just tribute to "America's unsung hero." [Applause.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MORTON D. HULL].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, what is the great lesson that comes from the conference in London? There may be many lessons, but there is one outstanding lesson, as I view the history of that interesting gathering. And that lesson is that you can not have naval reduction without security or without assuring to the contracting parties a sense of security, and that you can not give a sense of security in the present world without political agreements, and that political agreements imply the sanctions of force. The sanctions of force are implicit in all social order, and this is true in the relation of nations to each other as in the relation of the individual member of society to his fellow men. I am aware that this conclusion runs contrary to the prevailing American popular attitude expressed by Mr. Hoover in his Armistice Day speech of last November:

European nations have, by the covenant of the League of Nations, agreed that if nations fail to settle their differences peaceably, then force should be applied by other nations to compel them to be reasonable. We have refused to travel this road. We are confident that, at least in the Western Hemisphere, public opinion will suffice to check violations. This is the road we propose to travel.

Public opinion—that is, the mass opinion of the community—is an enormous force in our social order. None the less, we do not dispense with a police force because of the reasonableness of the public opinion of our particular neighborhood. We may live in a community of 10,000 people and have only four or five policemen. This is a tribute to the reasonableness of the community in which we live. None the less, we do have those four or five policemen. And this is because there is a criminal

fringe in all society that makes it impossible to dispense wholly with a police force, even though only a small police force. All we have said with reference to the community in which the individual lives is as true of international relations—of the society of nations as it is of the society of individuals. Perhaps it is more true. For the conflict of men against men, according to the primitive law of the jungle, in the society of individuals has long since been outlawed by civilized society. Public opinion does not tolerate it. Therefore the police power may be small. But the concept of a society of nations in which war has been outlawed is new and untried. We are slow to accept it. Nations are distrustful of each other. They have distinct recollections of past betrayals, and there still survive enough of those leaders of our national life who, while doing lip service to the idea of the outlawry of war, carry the opposite idea in their attitudes, so that we still feel their influence and fear our fellow nations. Foreign nations see the United States building a colossal navy at the same time that we are proposing a reduction of armaments, and immediately after we have ratified the Kellogg pact. They see us too, or at least they see some of our statesmen, claiming the present existence of a doctrine of the freedom of the seas inconsistent with the doctrine of the outlawry of war. Naturally, our good faith is questioned.

On the other hand, we see the dictator of a great Mediterranean power use the language of conquest to his people. We are forewarned by such speech. Indeed, we see in all of the nations enough of the survival of the jingo spirit to make us hesitate in the venture of disarmament. And others watching us are forewarned by what they feel to be a military attitude on our part. And so fear still exists. Can it be wondered that some of the nations at the London conference insist on the idea of security as a necessary prerequisite of the reduction of naval force, and on the idea of political agreements as the basis of such security?

Let me read to you this statement from a distinguished leader of some years ago. I will tell you who it is when I have finished the quotation:

From the international standpoint the essential thing to do is effectively to put the combined power of civilization back of the collective purpose of civilization to secure justice. This can be achieved only by a world league for the peace of righteousness, which would guarantee to enforce by the combined strength of all the nations the decrees of a competent and impartial court against any recalcitrant and defaulting nation.

The gentleman I have quoted from was a realist of the first water as well as an idealist. He was Mr. Theodore Roosevelt. [Applause.]

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SELVIG] such time as he may desire.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. SELVIG. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. SELVIG. Mr. Chairman, I desire to invite the attention of the House of Representatives for a brief period to-day to the future policy of the United States with respect to the Philippines. There is a growing feeling in this country that a definite decision regarding the Philippines ought to be made at an early date. I share in that feeling.

The House Committee on Insular Affairs should give earnest study to the several bills before it, report out a measure that the committee approves, and thus place the problem squarely before the House for final action.

I am willing to concede, at the outset, that the problem presents difficulties. All who have given it some thought and study will agree there are many phases of the Philippine independence problem which must be carefully considered before Congress expresses its judgment by voting on this important question.

The proposal to grant independence to the Philippines has recently been exhaustively discussed in committee hearings conducted by the Senate. The facts brought out during those hearings are available to all. For that reason I shall not review the historical facts which can be adduced in favor of Philippine independence. They have already been presented. I shall not, either, for lack of time and because they, too, are fully discussed in the hearings referred to, restate the numerous reasons, historic, moral, and humanitarian, which can be urged in behalf of independence.

I have requested the opportunity to-day to present briefly the economic side of this problem. I desire to add my testimony to that of the leaders of our national farm organizations and of

my colleagues in the House of Representatives and elsewhere, who see in the continuation of the present relationship between the Philippines and the United States a serious menace to our domestic agricultural interests.

I do not omit the important facts that can be presented showing the historical and moral reasons for granting Philippine independence, because I consider them to be of less importance than the economic side of the argument. Far from that. In fact, I consider the moral reasons paramount. I omit them solely because they have been fully and conclusively presented heretofore and because testimony fortifying these reasons is available in many official documents of our Government.

EXPORT TRADE OF THE PHILIPPINES

The increasing amount of duty-free importations from the Philippine Islands to the United States, of copra, coconut oil, and of sugar, which make up the bulk of these imports, can best be realized by studying the volume of export trade from the Philippines.

In 1900 exports from the Philippines to the United States aggregated 12.9 per cent of their total exports. The average for 1900 to 1908, inclusive, was 32 per cent. In 1909, the year free trade between the Philippines and the United States was established, the exports increased to 42.17 per cent. Ten years later it was 50 per cent, and in 1927 the United States received 74.59 per cent of the Philippine products.

As to whether there will be a large increase in the future of imports to the United States from the Philippines, I can only rely upon the testimony which has been presented upon numerous occasions and in great detail by competent students of the potential productive capacity of the Philippines. These men, who have first-hand knowledge of the situation, state that the Philippines are capable of very wide expansion of agricultural production beyond that which exists at the present time. In the future there will be, they aver, an expansion of agricultural and lumbering operations there to many times the present volume.

EXPORTS INCREASED 570 PER CENT

Philippine exports to the United States increased from one-seventh of their total exports in 1900 to three-quarters of their total exports in 1927. These figures indicate what may be expected in the future if the present duty-free privilege is continued. While this country receives a large proportion of other commodities, the United States is the sole market for all the coconut oil produced in the Philippines.

I realize that the present uncertainty as to what the United States will finally decide shall be done with the Philippines may result in slowing up current development. If it is determined that trade relations with the Philippines are to be continued on the present free-trade basis, we can confidently expect a tremendous expansion in exports to the United States. American capital seeking to benefit by low-priced labor in the Philippines would seek new fields there for development and exploitation. There can be no reasonable doubt as to this.

It is not my intention to present in elaborate detail the situation as I view it. I do, however, desire to take the time to make the situation clear with respect to sugar imports and the importation of vegetable oils from the Philippines.

IMPORTS OF SUGAR AND OILS

The production of sugar in the Philippines increased from 294,402 tons in 1898 to 740,987 tons in 1928. The sugar imported to the United States from the Philippines in 1927 aggregated 473,674 long tons. The ratio that the imports of sugar from the Philippine Islands bears to the total consumption of sugar in the United States is therefore of such magnitude at the present time as to seriously affect the domestic sugar-beet industry. I shall later submit detailed figures in support of this fact.

FUTURE PRODUCTION

Notwithstanding assurances that the sugar industry in the Philippines can not and will not be greatly expanded, the evidence seems quite positive that great areas are available for sugar plantations. Add to that an abundant labor supply from nearby countries, in case the supply of labor in the Philippines is insufficient, and it requires no great stretch of imagination to forecast a greatly increased production of sugar there.

In fact, one very eminent authority states that the Philippine sugar industry will have a maximum potential production annually of approximately 1,000,000 tons 10 years from now, assuming that the present free-trade relations between the United States are not disturbed.

SUGAR IMPORTS

According to information compiled by the United States Tariff Commission, the Philippines imported free into the United States for the calendar year of 1928 sugar worth \$46,873,000, which was 22.4 per cent of the total value imported from all

countries, including the Philippines, into the United States and 40.5 per cent of the total value of all commodities imported from the Philippines into the United States.

COCONUT-PRODUCTS IMPORTS

The report further shows that they imported during 1928 into the United States \$43,969,000 worth of coconut products, which was of the total value imported into the United States from all countries, including the Philippine Islands, 100 per cent of coconut oil, 72.6 per cent of copra, 76.9 per cent of coconut meat, desiccated, and 79.2 per cent of coconut oil cake or meal, which total coconut products imported into the United States from the Philippines were 38 per cent of the total value of their products imported into the United States.

The Payne-Aldrich Tariff Act of 1909, which gave duty-free entry into our ports to most of the products of the Philippines, limited the duty-free importations of Philippine sugar to a maximum of 300,000 tons per annum. From that time on the importations have increased to 473,674 long tons in 1927.

Now, let us look further into the copra and coconut-oil industries. From the figures presented in a letter dated September 30, 1929, to Senator WILLIAM E. BORAH by the two able Resident Commissioners from the Philippines we find, as taken from the Summary of Commerce of the United States, that the Philippines shipped into the United States 185,427,931 pounds of copra during the seven months ending July 31, 1929.

IMPORTS DURING 1928

For the year 1928 there were the following imports to the United States from the Philippine Islands:

| | Pounds |
|------------------|---------------|
| Coconut-oil cake | 22,743,466 |
| Coconut-oil meat | 46,695,592 |
| Cane sugar | 1,150,030,515 |
| Copra | 371,889,394 |
| Coconut oil | 290,636,702 |
| Tobacco | 3,726,967 |
| Cigars | 2,574,138 |

The importation of copra from the Philippines to the United States in each of the years 1927, 1928, and 1929 has been more than 300,000,000 pounds. The importation of coconut oil from the Philippines to the United States has increased from 281,654,000 pounds in 1927 to 411,936,213 pounds in 1929.

GRAVE MENACE TO DAIRY INTERESTS

The magnitude of these importations constitute a grave menace to the domestic dairy interests. It furnishes a substantial reason why the demand for Philippine independence is supported by the dairy groups of the United States. Their plea is for protection against this vast flood of oil which menaces the domestic oils and fats industry. Unless adequate protection is afforded, the domestic dairy industry and the oils and fats industries will be ruined. It is well understood that, regardless of whether there is free trade or not, copra will continue to be exported to this country. The dairy farmers demand a protective tariff on these importations.

Right here I wish to insert as a part of my remarks testimony given by Mr. Charles W. Holman, of Washington, D. C., representing the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation, the American Cotton Growers' Exchange, and the National Livestock Producers' Association, when he appeared before the Senate Committee on Finance and testified with reference to imports from the Philippine Islands. Mr. Holman testified as follows:

"The oils and fats problem, as we have told the committee several times, constitutes the largest single competitive problem that American farmers have to face in the pending tariff legislation. About \$148,000,000 worth of these oils and fats come into this country every year. Only about \$603,000,000 of products come in that compete with agricultural products of the farmer. Of that the Philippines send to us a considerable quantity. They send to us about 508,000,000 pounds of coconut oil—that is, of oil content.

Mr. Holman was referring to the last figures, which apply to the year 1927, and stated that this was coconut oil plus the coconut oil in the copra.

I wish also to refer to the fact that this coconut oil is a competitor with the dairy farmers. Mr. Holman states in his answers to the Committee on Finance the effect of coconut oil on the American farmer:

Senator BINGHAM. Are the dairy farmers interested in what goes into oleomargarine?

Mr. HOLMAN. Very deeply, sir. Oleomargarine is a great competitor with 85 to 88 score butter, and there is a differential usually—

Senator BINGHAM. Do you care whether it is made of coconut oil or cottonseed oil?

Mr. HOLMAN. Yes; we do. As a matter of fact, Senator, we would prefer to have it made from a domestic product, because then it would help our brother farmers in the southern section of the country and

tend to stop what is now a rather serious problem to us, namely, the increase of dairy cows in this country.

Senator BINGHAM. Coconut was developed as a food product, but I never knew that cottonseed was intended as a food product.

Mr. HOLMAN. Cottonseed oil is one of the best edible oils in the United States.

Senator CONNALLY. Most of your "olive oil" made up in Connecticut is made out of cottonseed oil. [Laughter.]

Senator BINGHAM. You should not give that away. [Laughter.]

Mr. HOLMAN. I shall have to find those figures a little later for you, Senator. I shall be glad to file them.

Senator SIMMONS. Originally almost all of the oleomargarine was made out of cottonseed oil?

Mr. HOLMAN. Originally; yes. It is something over 100—I should hate to give the figures here without referring to the statistics.

Senator COUZENS. They are all in the record, are they not?

Mr. HOLMAN. They are all in the record, however; and they show that at the present time only around 20,000,000 pounds of cottonseed oil is used in oleomargarine, whereas in the older days considerably over 150,000,000 pounds were used; and at the present time about a quarter of a billion pounds of coconut oil goes into oleomargarine making. The facts are that the prices of coconut oil do effect the prices of cottonseed oil and the other oils and fats in this country.

The United States can produce a plentiful supply of vegetable oils right here in our own country, even if all importations from the Philippines were shut out. Overproduction of dairy products in the United States seems imminent. The constantly increasing flow of Philippine vegetable oils greatly aggravates the danger which confronts our dairy farmers.

In a speech which I gave in the House of Representatives on March 2, 1929, the necessity was stressed of giving consideration to protecting our domestic producers from the vast volume of vegetable oils flowing into the United States from the Philippines.

Let me quote from that speech:

The acquisition of the Philippine Islands 30 years ago, a close student of our agricultural industry recently said, is costing the American farmers at least \$150,000,000 this year. These figures are conservative. Others say that the real cost is several times that much.

PHILIPPINE IMPORTS

I stated a few minutes ago that coconut-oil production in the Philippines now runs around 1,000,000,000 pounds per year, and that half of this is shipped into the United States. In this country coconut oil replaces American farm-produced oils and fats, pound for pound, and forces the higher-priced American products out of the United States into the cheaper foreign trade. This coconut oil goes principally to the soap and oleomargarine manufacturers and thus competes with the producers of lard, butter, cottonseed, soybeans, peanuts, flax, and even, to some extent, with corn.

Of the 575,000,000 pounds imported in 1927, 88 per cent came from the Philippines.

How does this vast importation affect the American farmers? One had but to listen to the testimony presented before the Ways and Means Committee to learn of this. All the witnesses were agreed that bringing 575,000,000 pounds of vegetable oils into the country simply takes away the market from 575,000,000 pounds of oils and fats produced on American farms, or almost 10 per cent of all the farm oils and fats in the United States.

As was stated in a recent study of this problem, the native who harvests coconuts in the jungles of Luzon is thus a considerable factor in holding down prices of hogs in the Middle West, of soybeans in Illinois and North Carolina, of cotton and peanuts in the South, of flax in the Northwest, and of dairy products all over the United States. At least 75 per cent of all the farmers in the Nation are affected in a substantial way by this form of competition.

VEGETABLE-OIL IMPORTS ARE INCREASING

What will happen in 5, 10, or 15 years hence? The producers of the country have a right to ask this question. This we know: The Philippine coconut industry is expanding at a tremendous rate. It is estimated that within five years the Philippine coconut-oil production will be above 1,600,000,000 pounds and above 2,000,000,000 pounds by 1939. Something must be done to stop this flood of oil.

The tariff on vegetable oil will be of no avail unless it is applied to oil coming from the Philippines, as well as to oil produced in foreign countries. This was also emphasized in the speech on the tariff which I gave on May 6, 1928.

These duty-free imports place our dairy and livestock farmers in direct competition with the labor of the Philippines and the Orient. The vast profits of the capitalists who exploit this cheap labor are well known. That their labor costs are low is shown by the following figures, showing daily minimum wages paid in the Philippines. The following table is for the year 1922:

Wages paid in the Philippines

| | Daily minimum |
|------------------------|---------------|
| Agricultural laborers | \$0.30 |
| Embroiderers | .25 |
| Fishermen | .50 |
| Hatters | .50 |
| Lumbermen | .30 |
| Miners | .87 |
| Printers | .70 |
| Sawyers | .75 |
| Masons and bricklayers | .60 |
| Mechanics | 1.20 |
| Blacksmiths | .65 |
| Unclassified laborers | .20 |

As was stated at the outset, my remarks would be too long if I enumerated the historic, moral, and humanitarian reasons for granting independence to the Philippines. I must confine myself to the economic side of the case, but want it distinctly understood that too great weight and prominence can not be given the other factors.

GROWING DEMAND FOR INDEPENDENCE

There has been a widespread interest in the Philippine independence question during the past year. As you will recall, it was given considerable consideration during the progress of the debate on the tariff bill in the Senate. On September 16, 1929, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] stated the situation so concisely and logically that I wish to call the attention of the House to one paragraph of his speech:

I am not going to discuss the Philippine question to-day, but it comes in here for consideration, because the American farmer at this time is carrying the entire load, from an economic standpoint, of the Philippines. I have wondered if the Philippines were producing manufactured goods as they are capable of producing agricultural products and were sending those manufactured goods into the United States, whether there would be the same equanimity among our friends as to giving free trade to the Philippines that there is at the present time? Duties can be levied as may be seen fit, and levied upon sugar, but the beet-sugar industry will disappear if it is compelled to fight the free-trade importations of the Philippines. Over 600,000,000 pounds of coconut oil and copra are imported each year into this country. These things come in conflict with the American producer, and so far as the bill goes they are left to compete with the Philippines upon a free-trade basis. It may or may not be a factor for this bill, but it is an element which enters into the picture of the condition of agriculture accentuating all the more the necessity for giving protection where it is possible to give it.

The logic of the argument of the Senator from Idaho is irrefutable.

DAIRY FARMERS ARE HIT

The present market for duty-free Philippine imports conflicts most severely with the market which a large group of our own people, the farmers, desire. Their real argument is that the Philippine market here interferes with the market of a large number of our own people in this country.

The movement to effect Philippine independence must not be allowed to drag until some indefinite time in the future. Every year of delay will fasten the present economic status and make it more difficult to secure a change. If the free-trade basis is permitted to continue for 20 years longer it will make the Philippine independence a political impossibility.

On the other hand, it will be necessary to grant a reasonable period of time before an independent resolution would take effect. The people of the Philippines should be allowed time in which to get ready for the new relationship which will involve necessary economic adjustments.

PRESS DISCUSSES INDEPENDENCE

Newspapers and the press generally have given much space to the discussion of the Philippine independence problem during the past year. On December 27, 1929, the Minneapolis Tribune published an editorial, "The Philippine issue grows warm again," which states the situation so clearly and logically that I desire to include it with my remarks:

THE PHILIPPINE ISSUE GROWS WARM AGAIN

The eastern press is professing great indignation because Representatives from dairy and sugar-beet States are demanding that the Philippine Islands be given their independence. The eastern commentators hold up their hands in horror at the idea of permitting agricultural considerations to become involved in a question of national policy.

We quite agree that the Philippine question is one which should be decided on its merits. We quite agree that it should be studied in all its aspects. But we see no reason for "strafing" the dairy and sugar-beet people because they wish the subject discussed. It is natural for people whose economic interests are adversely affected by a particular arrangement to ask for a thorough examination of that arrangement.

Congress can do no less than to make an audit of the Philippine situation.

The Tribune is unable to see where the Philippine adventure has, in the national sense, vindicated itself. Our national policy is pretty well summed up in the Monroe doctrine. The doctrine puts a rather arbitrary wall around the Western Hemisphere. We forbid outsiders to climb over that wall, we expand within the limits of the wall, and we do not ourselves venture much beyond the wall. That, in essence, is the national policy. We believe it to be sound. An island power like Britain no doubt had something to gain by picking up remote possessions all over the globe. But a policy which might be all right for an insular power like Britain might be all wrong for a continental power like the United States. It is our belief that if this country were offered the British Empire as a gift the wise mode of procedure would be to refuse it. We see nothing but grief in remote overseas adventuring.

The acquisition of the Philippines, in the first instance, represented a break with the well-established American policy. The Monroe doctrine does not encourage us to imitate the British policy of spreading out over the seven seas. On the contrary it is a pretty plain mandate to Americans to keep their activities confined to the Western Hemisphere. And that mandate only conforms to the dictates of common sense. What would happen if the United States were offered Bulgaria, for example? Americans would immediately declare that we had no business in the Balkans, and that the sensible thing would be to keep out of them. With our Haitis, our Nicaraguas, and our other inescapable problems, we have trouble enough in our own hemisphere. Why travel abroad and gratuitously saddle ourselves with more vexations?

It was probably national vanity that induced us to take over the Philippines. The words "Pacific power" has a lordly sound, and the word "empire" has a hypnotizing effect upon many individuals. But, so far as the Tribune can see, the United States ceased being American and "went British" temporarily when it first involved itself in the Philippines. We have no more business in the Far East than we have in the Near East.

We entered upon this Philippine adventure cautiously and timorously. We were careful to explain that we intended to stay in the Philippines only a short time. During the 30 years that we have been in the Philippines our policy has been one of bewilderment and befuddlement. Were we an empire-minded people we should simply have announced to the world another annexation and let the matter go at that. But we didn't know quite how to behave. We were imperialistic and non-imperialistic at one and the same time. We were reluctant to admit that we intended to keep the Philippines, and equally reluctant to fulfill our pledge regarding their independence. Throughout the Philippine adventure we have been Americans using a British accent. The result is we have been neither consistently American nor consistently British. Our policy has been a hybrid policy. We didn't want to go forward; we were in too deep to wade back.

As time went on the United States found itself confronted with a serious domestic problem, namely, the decline of its basic industry, agriculture. It also discovered that Philippine agricultural activity was injurious to American agricultural activity. Specifically, oleomargarine is a low-priced competitor of butter; and cheap coconut oil imported from the Philippines is a favorite element in the manufacture of margarine. Minnesota, the leading butter State in the Union, could not but be adversely affected by the competition. Right now oleomargarine is making serious inroads into the normal butter markets. Its use is increasing at the rate of 50,000,000 pounds a year. Less butter was received at the five major markets of America during 1928 than during 1927.

For a considerable period no group of Americans was much interested in the question of the Philippines. Recently the dairy people on observing that Philippine agricultural competition was hitting them where they lived, began to take a lively interest in the topic. The American Congress is sure to hear a great deal more about it during the next few months.

We believe that an overwhelmingly strong case is to be made out for granting the Philippines their economic independence. That is a different way of saying that an overwhelmingly strong case is to be made out for putting an end to the existing free-trade arrangement. The Philippines should have the right to levy whatsoever tariffs they pleased upon importations from the United States; and the rates written into the American tariff laws should apply to the Philippines exactly as they apply to Canada or any other foreign country. We believe that that much is owed both the Filipinos themselves and American agriculture. Blunder though we believe the acquisition of the Philippine Islands to have been, we are not prepared to say that the immediate severance of all political ties between the Philippines and the United States would be advantageous to either the islands or America. But we do not see that that issue, at the moment, is pertinent. Economic independence should precede political independence. The Philippine Islands should be allowed to develop their commercial activities on the basis of an independent nation. In no other way can they be fitted for political independence when it is ultimately accorded them.

Prompt action is necessary. Congress should give early attention to this problem.

EXACT RESTRICTION OF IMPORTS

Congressman CHARLES B. TIMBERLAKE, of Colorado, has advocated Philippine restriction of Philippine imports of sugar, copra, and coconut oil as an immediate step pending action by Congress for Philippine independence. In a recent statement Mr. TIMBERLAKE said:

I am more than ever convinced of the necessity of some form of restriction on duty-free Philippine agricultural imports as a measure of relief for American farmers. Producers of farm products in the islands, under low wage and living standards, are damaging our farmers in the United States market.

Our present policy is one of drifting, although this country's honor is pledged to give the Philippines their independence ultimately. Their political status is not clearly defined; a date ought to be fixed for their freedom. Sentiment favorable to such a course is rapidly growing throughout the United States.

The Filipinos have already received at Uncle Sam's hands more bounties than they can ever hope to repay. But we must either turn them loose soon or confront a most dangerous situation of competition from them within the United States to the detriment of our people. At the earliest favorable opportunity I will again renew the demand upon Congress from farm organizations of the United States for a solution of this problem.

His resolution, House Joint Resolution 330, which was reintroduced on May 5, 1930, should be passed before Congress adjourns. It is imperative that this first step be taken now.

The farmers of the United States are aroused. They demand action not only on the restriction resolution but also on the question of Philippine independence. [Applause.]

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I just came into the Chamber a moment ago, and I desire to make a brief statement in order that the committee may know something about the labors of the conferees on the tariff bill.

I understand that under the rules of the House you can not tell what occurs in the conference, neither is it permissible to disclose what anyone says there as a member of the conference or how their votes are cast. But I understand it is not entirely out of order to recite the facts as to when the conference meets and when it adjourns. So I will recite the fact that the conference met at 2 o'clock this afternoon. The conference adjourned about 4 or 5 minutes ago—and it is now 10 minutes of 3—until to-morrow morning at 10 o'clock.

The purpose of the conference in my opinion—and I think that that opinion is well based on fact—was for the purpose of giving an opportunity for a partisan conference—that is to say, that 6 Members—3 Members of the House and 3 Members of the Senate—might confer and agree upon what might be done when the full official conference should meet again to-morrow morning at 10 o'clock.

Now, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I have no complaint to make about that, but I will say that this bill has been considered in more of a partisan spirit than any other legislation in the history of the country.

First, the bill was made up by 15 Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee, and I shall put in the RECORD by permission the States which they represent, so that the country may understand just how the country as a whole is represented. The Republican Members who made up the bill and the States they represent are:

Hawley, Oregon; Treadway, Massachusetts; Bacharach, New Jersey; Hadley, Washington; Timberlake, Colorado; Watson, Pennsylvania; McLaughlin, Michigan; Kearns, Ohio; Chindblom, Illinois; Crowther, New York; Aldrich, Rhode Island; Estep, Pennsylvania; Ramseyer, Iowa; Davenport, New York; Frear, Wisconsin.

The bill was passed without an opportunity for a Democratic Member to offer an amendment, although the rule provided that members of the Ways and Means Committee might have preference in offering amendments authorized by that committee. After considering only 4 of the 434 pages, or 82 of the 10,681 lines in the bill, it was passed by the House and sent over to the Senate. The Senate gave it consideration from a partisan standpoint; that is to say, the Republican membership of the Finance Committee considered the bill without giving the Democratic members an opportunity to join in that consideration.

So the bill was reported to the Senate, and it was considered there, as bills can be considered in the Senate, with a full and free opportunity for every Member of the Senate to offer amendments and an opportunity for every Senator to express himself upon it, and to vote upon its various provisions which opportunity was denied the Members of the House.

It was sent to conference, and after full and free conference, as far as the Republican Members of the House would trust their conferees, it was reported back. You declined to trust your conferees on certain problems. You would not even take their word for it, Mr. Speaker. You would not trust the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY]; you would not trust the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BACHARACH]; you would not trust the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] and take their word for what they would do. But you compelled them, before you would intrust them with this piece of legislation, to agree to bring it back to the floor of the House with an opportunity for you to look it over. They did that. What was the result? The result is a reversal of your action on three very important provisions—sugar, cement, and shingles. Now, after you have voted on these and reversed them, you release them of all obligation to have a full and free conference on the part of the House.

The Senate met day before yesterday and agreed to another conference, and sent it back to the House, asking for an agreement by the House. The House gave its consent and it went back to conference. To-day we had this conference. It developed that again it is not a full and free conference. We can not bring back a complete conference report. It is impossible for your conferees to come to a conclusion because another body is not willing to trust their conferees, as you were not willing to trust yours.

They have not even secured absolution from all further consideration in the Senate, as to their promises as to what they will do on certain amendments. The result was we were in conference for three-quarters of an hour, and they finally resolved, at the suggestion of the best politician in the conference, probably, that "we had better send the Democrats out and get together and see if we can not arrive at a partisan conclusion."

They are over there now in conference, endeavoring to iron out their individual differences, and make up what in the beginning you intended it to be, a purely partisan bill, without any consideration of certain sections of the country, without certain sections of the country being represented, without an opportunity of having a voice even in the conference, but making it up as a partisan bill.

I think this has never been done in the history of this country, and the country does not believe in this kind of legislation. The country does not believe you ought to exclude from consideration in conference those you have delegated to perform that duty in order that you may iron out particular differences.

Mr. Speaker, unless you and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON] exercise your good offices and do it early, you are not going to have any tariff bill. I do not think that is going to hurt your feelings very much, Mr. Speaker. I do not know how it is with the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON] because he has gotten a great deal out of this bill. In fact, he has sewed up all the fences in Connecticut and all the surrounding territory, and has secured increases on almost everything from fish to battleships.

I just wanted to take this time, Mr. Speaker, to enter my protest against the methods pursued in the formulation and passage of this tariff bill. I do not believe it appeals to the good judgment of the Republican membership of this House. I do not believe in your consciences and in your hearts, you believe that it is the right thing, under our theory of government, to exclude from the consideration of legislation, even to the extent of a conference agreement, the entire minority side of the House. In my opinion, it can not be defended.

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARNER. Yes.

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. Is the sentiment the gentleman is evincing that of jealousy because he fears this is going to be a wonderfully popular bill, and that the Democrats are going to get the worst of it, because they are not permitted to be in on the making of it?

Mr. GARNER. Well, I do not know, Mr. Chairman, whether the gentleman refers to advantage from a party standpoint or advantage from the standpoint of the industries of the country. But if he means advantage from a party standpoint, I will say, sir, that I think the Democrats have the best of it in this instance and we are perfectly willing to let the Republicans have their way, but we do feel we have an obligation to discharge; that we have been elected to Congress by our constituents, and it is our duty to serve them the best we can and get the best legislation we possibly can from conference, from the House or from the Senate. We would be derelict in our duty if we permitted you and your party organization to exclude us entirely from the consideration of any legislation without entering our protest, and especially in not permitting us to

have an opportunity to contribute what we can toward perfecting a very bad piece of legislation under the best of conditions.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARNER. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. What particular difference does it make anyway, if the Republicans are willing to assume the responsibility of the bill, because the gentleman and those for whom he is speaking intend to vote against it, and prevent it from becoming a law if possible. So what difference does it make whether you are taken into the conference for the purpose of helping write the provisions of the bill?

Mr. GARNER. I would call the gentleman's attention to the fact that if he will examine the record made last week he will find that his statement is not borne out. As I recall—I do not have it before me, but I have it on my desk—over 90 Republicans joined with the Democrats, over the protest of their organization and against the judgment of the 15 Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee, and adopted a policy with reference to certain items in this bill.

It is my duty to represent the minority members, and as long as I am one of the conferees I am going to do my duty and protest in each instance against the unfairness of it, the injustice of it, the un-Americanism of it, and the parliamentary methods you have adopted in passing this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. COLLIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARNER. Yes.

Mr. COLLIER. I want to ask the gentleman if it does not go further than that? Does not that kind of a practice destroy our representative government and form of government?

Mr. GARNER. To my mind it is very unfair, un-American and it is not in accord with our Constitution. It is our theory of government that all shall be represented, but if we had left it to the Republican membership you would not have made the changes which were made last week. Those changes were made by Democrats; those changes were made by virtue of Democratic votes, and you would never have given them to us except you were forced to do so under the rules of the House, or else you would have been forced to bring in a rule that would have gagged this House to a point where you could not have adopted it. I want to say that if you had attempted to avoid the votes which were taken last week the Republican side of this House would have revolted against any such rule, a rule which would have provided for the taking away from the House all possible opportunity of passing on differences between the two Houses on amendments that had to be brought back to the respective bodies.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARNER. Certainly.

Mr. DENISON. Do I understand, then, that the gentleman from Texas is opposed to the system of party government that we have always had in this country?

Mr. GARNER. Oh, no; and the gentleman should not indicate anything of the kind. I am an intense believer in party government, but I do say that party government does not go to the extent of excluding the other party from the consideration of legislation either in the House or in conference. I do not believe that in the name of party government you should do an unjust thing and not give the minority an opportunity to consider legislation. The gentleman is on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and you have party government there. Suppose your party determines upon a policy with reference to matters coming before your committee, would the gentleman advocate excluding all the minority from the deliberations of the committee, and after the proposed legislation got into the House of Representatives, would you prevent them from offering amendments to perfect the legislation, and would you go still further and when you were on the conference committee with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] would you favor excluding him from the room while you prepared the party's program with reference to the legislation from your committee? Would the gentleman do that? Answer my question.

Mr. DENISON. I would not exclude anybody, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. GARNER. That is all I am asking in this instance.

Mr. DENISON. But since the gentleman has asked me the question, I would say that when the two political parties go to the country on a political issue like the tariff question and one

of them wins an overwhelming victory, I think the others ought to take their defeat like sportsmen and let the winning party write the law; and if the Democrats go to the country on the tariff issue, as they have done heretofore, and win the election overwhelmingly, the Democratic Party ought to be allowed to write the tariff bill.

Mr. GARNER. Why should not that apply to every other piece of legislation that involves party politics?

Mr. DENISON. It ought to apply if it is a party question.

Mr. GARNER. They are party questions. Do you not have party questions on matters outside of the tariff? The gentleman answered the question by saying he would not exclude the Democrats on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, but would give them an opportunity in the House to offer amendments to perfect any proposed legislation. The gentleman also said he would not exclude them from the conference. All I am complaining about in regard to this legislation is that from the very beginning no such policy, as the gentleman says he would follow, has been pursued with reference to this legislation. On the contrary, you have excluded every Democrat from any consideration, not only in committee but in the House of Representatives, and now when you get into difficulties, after we have gone along with you and have made up a partial report with respect to over 1,200 items, you come in and in your last moments, when you are in great distress, you propose to exclude them from the deliberations of the conference.

Mr. Chairman, I merely want to enter my protest against this procedure and to let the House of Representatives know it is our desire to contribute what we can to this legislation. [Applause.]

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HOCH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 12236) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PILGRIMAGE OF MOTHERS AND WIDOWS OF DECEASED SOLDIERS, SAILORS, ETC., TO CEMETERIES IN EUROPE

Mr. WURZBACH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4138) to amend the act of March 2, 1929, entitled "An act to enable the mothers and widows of the deceased soldiers, sailors, and marines of the American forces now interred in the cemeteries of Europe, to make a pilgrimage to these cemeteries," and I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas calls up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4138) and asks unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4138) having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "That the act of March 2, 1929, entitled 'An act to enable the mothers and widows of the deceased soldiers, sailors, and marines of the American forces now interred in the cemeteries of Europe to make a pilgrimage to these cemeteries,' be, and is hereby, amended to authorize the Secretary of War to arrange for pilgrimages to cemeteries in Europe by mothers and widows of those members of the military or naval forces of the United States who died in the military or naval service at any time between April 5, 1917, and July 1, 1921, wherein death and burial of the member occurred at sea or wherein the death of the member occurred at sea or overseas but whose place of interment is unknown, or who is interred in any identified grave in Europe, the same as is provided in the case of mothers and widows of members of said forces whose remains are now interred in identified graves in

cemeteries in Europe, at the expense of the United States and under the conditions set forth in section 2 of said act"; and the Senate agree to the same.

HARRY C. RANSLEY,
HARRY M. WURZBACH,
PERCY E. QUIN,

Managers on the part of the House.

DAVID BAIRD, JR.,
PATRICK SULLIVAN,
MORRIS SHEPPARD,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4138) to amend the act of March 2, 1929, entitled "An act to enable the mothers and widows of the deceased soldiers, sailors, and marines of the American forces now interred in the cemeteries of Europe to make a pilgrimage to these cemeteries," submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to the amendment agreed:

The amendment of the Senate to section 1 of the House bill provided that mothers be permitted to make the pilgrimage to any identified grave of a United States World War soldier, sailor, or marine buried in Europe whether the grave be in a cemetery or not. The act of March 2, 1929, provided that the pilgrimage be only to cemeteries. To this amendment your conferees agreed. The same Senate amendment, however, struck out the language of the House which permitted the mothers of sons buried at sea or in unknown graves in Europe to make the trip. By action of the conferees this language was restored, so that the law as amended will permit the mothers of United States soldiers, sailors, or marines who are buried in Europe in graves where they fell or in cemeteries, who are buried in unknown graves, or who died at sea, to make one pilgrimage to Europe at the expense of the United States Government.

HARRY C. RANSLEY,
HARRY M. WURZBACH,
PERCY E. QUIN,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. WURZBACH. I will state that the conferees unanimously agreed upon this report. The effect of the conference report is to approve the bill as it passed the House, with the addition of the following language, "or who is interred in any identified grave in Europe," so that the bill now reads as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of March 2, 1929, entitled "An act to enable the mothers and widows of the deceased soldiers, sailors, and marines of the American forces now interred in the cemeteries of Europe to make a pilgrimage to these cemeteries," be, and is hereby, amended to authorize the Secretary of War to arrange for pilgrimages to cemeteries in Europe by mothers and widows of those members of the military or naval forces of the United States who died in the military or naval service at any time between April 5, 1917, and July 1, 1921, wherein death and burial of the member occurred at sea or overseas, but whose place of interment is unknown, or who is interred in any identified grave in Europe, the same as is provided in the case of mothers and widows of members of said forces whose remains are now interred in identified graves in cemeteries in Europe, at the expense of the United States and under the conditions set forth in section 2 of said act.

As stated before, the words "or who is interred in any identified grave in Europe" are the only words added to the House bill as it passed the House on March 4, 1930, and no words have been subtracted therefrom.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WURZBACH. I yield.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I spoke on the floor yesterday, and referred to a bill, H. R. 4109, introduced by me originally, authorizing the pilgrimage back in 1923, and so I am very much interested in this legislation.

As I understand, this amendment takes care of the mothers of the boys whose graves are not known but who are buried within a certain area. I think that is an excellent amendment, because I have a case where a mother lost two or three sons in the Argonne. They do not know where they are buried but she believes that she can find where they are buried, and under the present law she could not go on the pilgrimage, but this will take care of a case of that kind.

Mr. WURZBACH. Yes; and the gentleman has been very helpful in this legislation. He was one of its pioneers.

Mr. McCORMACK of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WURZBACH. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK of Massachusetts. Is it the intention to cover the case of men reported lost in action, the inference being that they were killed and perhaps blown to pieces? Does the gentleman understand that the phraseology will cover mothers of those unfortunate men?

Mr. WURZBACH. I think the bill as amended will cover those cases. In fact, the language in the original bill covers such cases, and the amendment we have adopted makes the law more liberal in another respect.

Mr. McCORMACK of Massachusetts. It was the intention of the committee to cover the mothers of those boys—the case where the Government does not know whether they are buried or whether they were blown to pieces.

Mr. WURZBACH. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK of Massachusetts. I wanted the gentleman's opinion because it might assist in the interpretation of the law.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

CLAIM OF THE GOVERNMENT OF NORWAY (S. DOC. NO. 144)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed.

To the Congress of the United States:

I inclose a report received from the Secretary of State requesting the submission to the present Congress of the claim presented by the Government of Norway against the United States for reimbursement on account of losses sustained by reason of the detention of the Norwegian steamer *Tampen* by the United States Coast Guard during June, 1925.

I concur in the recommendation made by the Secretary of State and recommend that, as an act of grace and without reference to the question of the legal liability of the United States in the matter, the Congress authorize an appropriation in the sum of \$8,765 in order to effect the settlement of all claims arising as a result of detention of the vessel.

HERBERT HOOVER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 9, 1930.

BRIDGE OVER THE MISSOURI RIVER AT RANDOLPH, MO.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, the House passed a bill some little time ago extending the time for building a bridge across the Missouri River at Randolph, Mo. The Senate has passed it and made a slight amendment. It is H. R. 8562, to extend the time for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Randolph, Mo. I ask unanimous consent that it be taken from the Speaker's table and that the House agree to the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the bill and the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill and the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, after "Company," insert "its successors and assigns."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE FRENCH BROAD RIVER IN JEFFERSON COUNTY, TENN.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 4174, and consider the same.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 4174. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Highway Department of the State of Tennessee to construct a bridge across the French Broad River on the Dandridge-Newport Road, in Jefferson County, Tenn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARNER. Reserving the right to object, I want to put in the Record a statement concerning the omnibus bridge bill. That bill, if I remember it, passed the House and went to the Senate, and was held up in the Senate committee for quite a length of time. Finally it was reported to the Senate and passed with Senate amendments. As I recall there are some 20 authorizations in the bill for building bridges. They are being held up, and the opportunity to begin construction work in these

various authorizations is being held up. In one instance I know it has cost some money, and if it is not passed within 30 days it will cost one organization some \$5,000. I am wondering why it is that we can not have a report upon that from the conference committee. I know the gentleman is in charge of bridge bills, and we look to him to facilitate the passage of these bills.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I found objections raised by one of the Senators to one or two of the items in the bill. The Senate finally reported the bill and passed it with amendments. They struck out the name of the grantee in one or two of the bridge franchises and substituted some other parties. Since then the Senate has been so busily occupied by the consideration of the Parker nomination to the Supreme Court that I was unable to get a conference. The Senators have told me that as soon as that matter was disposed of they would go to conference on the bill and I am hoping to get a conference to-morrow or early next week.

Mr. GARNER. Then, the gentleman hopes to get a full conference report, so that the bill may be sent to the President.

Mr. DENISON. I shall do the best that I can.

Mr. GARNER. I do not desire to criticize the other body or any individual Member, but it seems strange to me, and I think to the membership of the House, that one man in another body can hold up 23 proposed authorizations that contribute to the commerce of the country. It is still a little more strange that in the consideration of a House bill they would strike out an authorization designed for A and substitute B. I do not think such a thing has been called to my attention in the last 10 years.

Mr. DENISON. The gentleman from Texas is correct. I do not know when it has ever been done before, but it has been done in this case, and it is very much to be regretted. We will try to work that out in conference. Our committee grants no monopolies in bridge franchises, and we would willingly grant an additional franchise to any other parties, if a Senator should file a bill for that purpose.

Mr. GARNER. I hope the gentleman succeeds at an early date.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Highway Department of the State of Tennessee, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge and approaches thereto across the French Broad River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, on the Dandridge-Newport Road, in Jefferson County, Tenn., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS OHIO RIVER, CARROLLTON, KY.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 4173) for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Carrollton, Ky., a similar House bill being reported from the committee and on the calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of the bridge across the Ohio River at or near Carrollton, Ky., authorized to be built by the State highway commission, Commonwealth of Kentucky, by the act of Congress approved February 26, 1929, are hereby extended one and three years, respectively, from the date of approval hereof.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was ordered to lie on the table.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and under the rule referred as follows:

S. 135. An act to provide for the payment of benefits received by the Palute Indian Reservation lands within the New-

lands irrigation project, Nev., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

S. 226. An act authorizing the issuing of certificates of arrival to persons born in the United States who are now aliens; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

S. 1072. An act for the relief of Gabriel Roth; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1378. An act for the relief of Juan Anorbe, Charles C. J. Wirz, Rudolph Ponevacs, Frank Guelfi, Steadman Martin, Athanasios Metaxiotis, and Olaf Nelson; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1571. An act for the relief of William K. Kennedy; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1644. An act authorizing the county of Vanderburgh, Ind., to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Ohio River at or near Evansville, Ind.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1683. An act for the relief of John Heffron; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1721. An act directing the retirement of acting assistant surgeons of the United States Navy at the age of 64 years; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1851. An act for the relief of S. Vaughan Furniture Co., Florence, S. C.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2187. An act for the relief of S. Dwight Hunt; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 2567. An act granting travel pay and other allowances to certain soldiers of the Spanish-American War and the Philippine insurrection who were discharged in the Philippines; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 2721. An act to provide for the advancement on the retired list of the Navy of Frederick L. Caudle; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 2774. An act for the relief of Nick Rizou Theodore; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2811. An act for the relief of Oscar R. Hahnel; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2892. An act for the relief of Helen F. Griffin and Ada W. Allen; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2896. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Oregon and the Stock Slough Drainage District to construct, maintain, and operate a dam and dike to prevent the flow of tidal waters into Stock Slough, Coos Bay, Coos County, Oreg.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

S. 2897. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Oregon and the Beaver Slough Drainage District to construct, maintain, and operate a dam and dike to prevent the flow of tidal waters into Beaver Slough, Coquille River, Coos County, Oreg.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

S. 2898. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Oregon and the Larson Slough Drainage District to construct, maintain, and operate a dam and dike to prevent the flow of tidal waters into Larson Slough, Coos Bay, Coos County, Oreg.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

S. 3044. An act to amend section 39 of title 39 of the United States Code; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

S. 3277. An act to provide against the withholding of pay when employees are removed for breach of contract to render faithful service; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

S. 3298. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Evansville, Ind.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 3407. An act for the relief of Judson Stokes; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 3466. An act to legalize the water pipe line constructed by the Searcy Water Co. under the Little Red River near the town of Searcy, Ark.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 3553. An act for the relief of R. A. Ogee, sr.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 3555. An act authorizing the purchase, establishment, and maintenance of an experimental farm or orchard in Mobile County, State of Alabama, and authorizing an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 3868. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Lamar Lumber Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad bridge across the West Pearl River at or near Talisheek, La.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 3873. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Carondelet, Mo.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 3950. An act authorizing the establishment of a migratory bird refuge in the Cheyenne Bottoms, Barton County, Kans.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 3965. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to grant an easement to the Wabash Railway Co. over the St. Charles Rifle Range, St. Louis County, Mo.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 4140. An act providing for the sale of the remainder of the coal and asphalt deposits in the segregated mineral land in the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations, Okla., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 4157. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing a bridge across the Tennessee River at or near Chattanooga, Hamilton County, Tenn.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 4227. An act to authorize the Board of Education of the District of Columbia to make certain provisions for the relief of congestion in the public schools of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 4269. An act authorizing the Commonwealth of Kentucky, by and through the State Highway Commission of Kentucky or the successors of said commission, to acquire, construct, maintain, and operate bridges within Kentucky and/or across boundary-line streams of Kentucky; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 645. An act for the relief of Lyma Van Winkle;

H. R. 1794. An act to authorize the payment of an indemnity to the owners of the British steamship *Kyleakin* for damages sustained as a result of a collision between that vessel and the U. S. S. *William O'Brien*.

H. R. 1954. An act for the relief of A. O. Gibbens;

H. R. 2902. An act to authorize the sale of the Government property acquired for a post-office site in Binghamton, N. Y.;

H. R. 3246. An act to authorize the sale of the Government property acquired for a post-office site in Akron, Ohio;

H. R. 3717. An act to add certain lands to the Fremont National Forest in the State of Oregon;

H. R. 6564. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7069. An act for the relief of the heirs of Viktor Pettersson;

H. R. 7832. An act to reorganize the administration of Federal prisons; to authorize the Attorney General to contract for the care of United States prisoners; to establish Federal jails, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8299. An act authorizing the establishment of a national hydraulic laboratory in the Bureau of Standards of the Department of Commerce and the construction of a building therefor;

H. R. 8578. An act to sell the present post-office site and building at Dover, Del.;

H. R. 8918. An act authorizing conveyance to the city of Trenton, N. J., of title to a portion of the site of the present Federal building in that city;

H. R. 9324. An act to dedicate for street purposes a portion of the old post-office site at Wichita, Kans.;

H. R. 9325. An act to authorize the United States Veterans' Bureau to pave the road running north and south immediately east of and adjacent to Hospital No. 90, at Muskogee, Okla., and to authorize the use of \$4,950 of funds appropriated for hospital purposes, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9407. An act to amend the act of Congress approved May 29, 1928, authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to accept title to certain real estate, subject to a reservation of mineral rights in favor of the Blackfeet Tribe of Indians;

H. R. 9437. An act to authorize a necessary increase in the White House police force;

H. R. 9758. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to close certain portions of streets and alleys for public-school purposes; and

H. R. 9845. An act to authorize the transfer of Government-owned land at Dodge City, Kans., for public-building purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. J. Res. 165. Joint resolution authorizing the settlement of the case of United States against the Sinclair Crude Oil Purchasing Co., pending in the United States District Court in and for the District of Delaware.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. CAMPBELL, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 389. An act for the relief of Kenneth M. Orr;
H. R. 707. An act to authorize an appropriation for construction at Fort McKinley, Portland, Me.;

H. R. 973. An act to remove the age limit of persons who may be confined at the United States Industrial Reformatory at Chillicothe, Ohio;

H. R. 1301. An act for the relief of Julius Victor Keller;
H. R. 1444. An act for the relief of Marmaduke H. Floyd;
H. R. 2161. An act to convey to the city of Waltham, Mass., certain Government land for street purposes;

H. R. 3527. An act to authorize credit in the disbursing accounts of certain officers of the Army of the United States for the settlement of individual claims approved by the War Department;

H. R. 4198. An act to authorize the exchange of certain lands adjoining the Catoosa Springs (Ga.) Target Range;

H. R. 5283. An act to declare valid the title to certain Indian lands;

H. R. 5726. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to deliver to the custody of the city of Salem, Mass., and to the Salem Marine Society, of Salem, Mass., the silver-service set and bronze clock, respectively, which have been in use on the cruiser *Salem*;

H. R. 6338. An act authorizing the erection of a sanitary, fireproof hospital at the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, of Togus, Me.;

H. R. 6645. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion to deliver to the president of the Lions Club, of Shelbyville, Tenn., a bell of any naval vessel that is now, or may be, in his custody; and to the president of the Rotary Club, of Shelbyville, Tenn., a steering wheel of any naval vessel that is now, or may be, in his custody;

H. R. 7410. An act to establish a hospital for defective delinquents;

H. R. 7395. An act to extend to Government postal cards the provision for defacing the stamps on Government stamped envelopes by mailers;

H. R. 7413. An act to amend an act providing for the parole of United States prisoners, approved June 25, 1910, as amended;

H. R. 8052. An act authorizing the heirs of Elijah D. Myers to purchase land in section 7, township 28 south, range 11 west, Willamette meridian, county of Coos, State of Oregon;

H. R. 8368. An act providing for a study regarding the construction of a highway to connect the northwestern part of the United States with British Columbia, Yukon Territory, and Alaska in cooperation with the Dominion of Canada;

H. R. 8650. An act to authorize the Postmaster General to charge for services rendered in disposing of undelivered mail in those cases where it is considered proper for the Postal Service to dispose of such mail by sale or to dispose of collect-on-delivery mail without collection of the collect-on-delivery charges or for a greater or less amount than stated when mailed;

H. R. 8713. An act granting land in Wrangell, Alaska, to the town of Wrangell, Alaska;

H. R. 8763. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and report to Congress on the advisability and practicability of establishing a national park to be known as the Apostle Islands National Park, in the State of Wisconsin, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8805. An act to authorize the acquisition for military purposes of land in the county of Montgomery, State of Alabama, for use as an addition to Maxwell Field;

H. R. 8973. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to deliver to the custody of the Charleston Museum, of Charleston, S. C., the ship's bell, plaque, war record, and silver service of the cruiser *Charleston* that is now, or may be in his custody;

H. R. 9235. An act to authorize the Public Health Service to provide medical service in the Federal prisons;

H. R. 9434. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River at or near Arlington, Oreg.;

H. R. 10258. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Cannelton, Ind.;

H. R. 10474. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Arkansas State Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the White River at or near Sylamore, Ark.;

H. R. 10581. An act to provide for the addition of certain lands to the Yosemite National Park, Calif., and for other purposes;

H. R. 10674. An act authorizing payment of six months' death gratuity to beneficiaries of transferred members of the Fleet Naval Reserve and Fleet Marine Corps Reserve who die while on active duty;

H. R. 11046. An act to legalize a bridge across the Hudson River at Stillwater, N. Y.;

H. J. Res. 188. Joint resolution authorizing the use of tribal funds belonging to the Yankton Sioux Tribe of Indians in South Dakota to pay expenses and compensation of the members of the tribal business committee for services in connection with their pipestone claim; and

H. J. Res. 244. Joint resolution authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the International Petroleum Exposition at Tulsa, Okla., to be held October 4 to 11, 1930, inclusive.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.), pursuant to the order heretofore made, the House adjourned until Monday, May 12, 1930, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Saturday, May 10, 1930, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS NO. 2

(10 a. m.)

To consider the Hill-Palmisano contested-election case.

For Monday, May 12, 1930:

COMMITTEE ON THE CENSUS

(10.30 a. m.)

Authorizing the Director of the Census to collect and publish certain additional cotton statistics (S. 2322 and S. 2323).

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

(10.30 a. m.)

To license and regulate the business of making loans in sums of \$300 or less, secured or unsecured, prescribing the rate of interest and charge therefor and penalties for the violation thereof, and regulating assignments of wages and salaries when given as security for any such loans (H. R. 7628).

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

457. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriations pertaining to the Legislative Establishment, United States Senate, for the fiscal year 1930, amounting to \$30,000 (H. Doc. No. 391); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

458. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriations pertaining to the Legislative Establishment under the Architect of the Capitol for the fiscal year 1930, amounting to \$22,054.63 (H. Doc. No. 392); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

459. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriations for the Office of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital for the fiscal year 1931, amounting to \$58,247 (H. Doc. No. 393); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

460. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriations pertaining to the Legislative Establishment, House of Representatives, for the fiscal year 1930, amounting to \$96,234.12 (H. Doc. No. 394); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. WILLIAMSON: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. H. R. 11978. A bill to authorize the appointment of employees in the executive branch of the govern-

ment and the District of Columbia; with amendment (Rept. No. 1411). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 1268. An act authorizing the States of Illinois and Indiana to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Wabash River, at or near Vincennes, Ind.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1413). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BECK: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 3421. An act to authorize the Tidewater Toll Properties (Inc.), its legal representatives and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Choptank River at a point at or near Cambridge, Md.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1414). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BECK: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 3422. An act to authorize the Tidewater Toll Properties (Inc.), its legal representatives and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Patuxent River, south of Burch, Calvert County, Md.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1415). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HUDDLESTON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 4182. An act granting the consent of Congress to the county of Georgetown, S. C., to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Pee Dee River and a bridge across the Waccamaw River, both at or near Georgetown, S. C.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1416). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. McLEOD: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 1518. A bill for the relief of J. W. Anderson; without amendment (Rept. No. 1407). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Missouri: Committee on Claims. H. R. 7534. A bill for the relief of the Brookhill Corporation; without amendment (Rept. No. 1408). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. H. R. 8103. A bill for the relief of the American Falls Realty & Water Works Co. (Ltd.), of Power County, Idaho; without amendment (Rept. No. 1409). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. IRWIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 10542. A bill for the relief of John A. Arnold; with amendment (Rept. No. 1410). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HOPKINS: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 9471. A bill for the relief of Florence M. Humphries; with amendment (Rept. No. 1412). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ARENTZ: A bill (H. R. 12282) to place an embargo on silver; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRITTEN: A bill (H. R. 12283) to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels required under the London Naval Conference, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CROSSER: A bill (H. R. 12284) to provide for the construction of vessels for the Coast Guard for rescue and assistance work on Lake Erie; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SPROUL of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 12285) to authorize the Postmaster General to purchase motor-truck parts from the truck manufacturer; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. THATCHER: A bill (H. R. 12286) to repeal the act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell and patent certain lands in Louisiana and Mississippi," approved April 11, 1928; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12287) authorizing the Commonwealth of Kentucky, by and through the State Highway Commission of Kentucky, or the successors of said commission, to acquire, construct, maintain, and operate bridges within Kentucky and/or across boundary-line streams of Kentucky; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEAVITT: A bill (H. R. 12288) to amend the act entitled "An act to permit taxation of lands of homestead and desert-land entrymen under the reclamation act," approved April 21, 1928; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. REID of Illinois: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 334) to amend the radio act of 1927 by providing for 3 Government

broadcasting frequencies, 1 for the Department of Agriculture, 1 for the Department of the Interior, and 1 for the Department of Labor; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOYLAN: A bill (H. R. 12289) for the relief of Capt. Christian Damson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CRAIL: A bill (H. R. 12290) granting a pension to Charles H. Ingersoll; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DOMINICK: A bill (H. R. 12291) granting a pension to John E. Winn; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12292) granting a pension to Will Ralph Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HANCOCK: A bill (H. R. 12293) granting an increase of pension to Lucy E. Bryant; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HESS: A bill (H. R. 12294) granting an increase of pension to Barbara Ann Felix; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOPKINS: A bill (H. R. 12295) granting an increase of pension to Celina E. Hutton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KENDALL of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 12296) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth A. Glisan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANKFORD of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 12297) granting a pension to Grover C. Fennell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SLOAN: A bill (H. R. 12298) for the relief of George P. Sterling; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TABER: A bill (H. R. 12299) granting a pension to Etta A. Vinn Combes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 12300) for the relief of Edward S. Ryan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12301) for the relief of John S. Dodge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

7240. By Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma: Petition of National Retail Dry Goods Association, New York, transmitting proposed amendments to House bill 11852, and urging that they be adopted; to the Committee on Patents.

7241. Also, petition of National Alliance of Postal Employees, Pittsburgh, Pa.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

7242. Also, petition of city carriers of Stillwater, Okla., urging support of House bill 6603; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

7243. By Mr. THOMPSON: Petition of citizens of Fulton County, Ohio, urging early favorable action on House bill 229, to grant an allowance on personally owned post-office equipment; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

7244. By Mr. STONE: Petition signed by L. E. Gray, secretary Postal Clerks, and seven other clerks of Stillwater, Okla., providing for shorter hours for all postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

SENATE

MONDAY, May 12, 1930

The Chaplain, Rev. ZeBarney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who through the mystery of instinct dost lead all living things along their way, grant that we may hear Thy voice, which calls us to be true and steadfast, and so—unafraid.

Take of Thine own spirit and lay it upon us—the spirit of fatherly care for all Thy children, the spirit of the Saviour's love for the erring and the lost, the spirit of the Comforter's tenderness for every sad and lonely soul.

Fill our cup each morning with the water of life, that we may give to him that is athirst; put into our hearts such living words from Thee that nothing we may say shall fall to the ground, returning to Thee void. Help us to make the welfare of all the supreme law of our land, that our commonwealth may rest secure upon the love of all its citizens, that the blessing of the Nation may fall upon our service and rise triumphant unto Thee. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.